Dramas of BHASA



DRAMAS OF BHASA

SEMINAR PAPERS AND TSS CENTENARY ADDRESS

Edited and published by

Dr. T. DEVARAJAN

DEPARTMENT OF SANSKRIT
UNIVERSITY OF KERALA
KARIAVATTOM
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM-81

DRAMAS OF BHASA
SEMINAR PAPERS AND TSS CENTENARY ADDRESS

Edited and published by
Dr. T. DEVARAJAN

Rs.200/-
Published by
Department of Sanskrit
University of Kerala
Kariavattom P.O.
Trivandrum-695 581
Phone : 0471-2418401

2005

Dedicated to the venerable memory of

Sri. T. Ganapati Sastri

दग्धाऽप्यदग्धा। **Though burnt not burned**

उपरताऽप्यनुपरता। **Though expired not expired**

Bhasa



T. Ganapati Sastri

Die Philosophische Fakultät

der Eberhard-Karls-Universität zu Tübingen

verleiht dem Herrn

T. Ganapati Shastri

dem verdienten Herausgeber der Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, der durch die Auffindung und Veröffentlichung der dem berühmten Dichter Bhāsa zugeschriebenen Dramen seinen Namen in der ganzen Kulturwelt rühmlich bekannt gemacht hat,

ehrenhalber die Würde eines

Doktors der Philosophie.

Zum Zeugnis dessen ist diese Urkunde ausgestellt, von Kanzler und Dekan unterzeichnet und mit dem Siegel der Fakultät versehen worden.

Tübingen, den 1. Mai 1924

Der Kanzler

Der Dekan

Preface

The **Dramas of Bhasa - Seminar Papers** and TSS Centenary Address is a collection of papers presented in two National level Seminars on **Dramas of Bhasa** organised by the Department of Sanskrit, University of Kerala on 25-26 February 1999 and 26-27 February 2004 respectively, at the Senate Chamber, Thiruvananthapuram. A total of 30 papers were presented and deliberated seriously in these seminars. The second seminar focused to celebrate the **Centenary of the Discovery and Publication of the Dramas of Bhasa** by Sri.T. Ganapati Sastri, the Mastermind behind the T.S.S. **Bhasa plays and Trivandrum Sanskrit Series Centenary Address** enlightens one on the history, discovery and publication of a series of Manuscripts from the Palace Library of the erstwhile Travancore Royal Family under the leadership of Sri.T.Ganapati Sastri. This volume is presented to the memory of the venerable scholar Sri.Sastri. His portrait and replica of the Doctorate Degree awarded to him by the Tubingen University in 1924 and a brief biography are included in this volume to commemorate his valuable contribution. **Bhasa problem, Bhasa problem Again and Bhasa problem Reviewed** are the other notable articles that make Ganapati Sastri's findings lively deliberated even today. The remaining eleven articles are serious

studies on the different aspects of the Dramas of Bhasa. Some of the serious papers presented and deliberated in the seminars were not made available for print. This volume will surely be useful for scholars to have a first hand information regarding the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, the history of the present Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library and above all the Dramas of Bhasa. I hope that this volume will be received with pleasure by the Scholarly Community.

Thanks are due to Madhurima Softek DTP Centre, Ambalathinkara, Kazhakkuttom and S. B. Press, Tutors Lane, Trivandrum for their service to publish this work.

Dr. T. DEVARAJAN

CONTENTS

LIFE AND WORKS OF T. GANAPATI SASTRI

Dr. T. Devarajan

T. Ganapathi Sastri, son of Ramasubha Iyer was born in 1860 A.D. at Tiruvai in Tirunelveli District of Tamilnadu. Ramasubha Iyer was a scion of the family of the celebrated Appayya Dīkṣitar. After his basic education, the young Sastri migrated to Trivandrum at the age of sixteen and had his higher studies under Subha Dīkṣitar of Kadayam and Dharmādhikāri Karamanai Subrahmanya Sastri. He had won a ring from Prince Vaśākham Tirunāl as an award for his poetic genius expressed in his first composition *Mādhavavilāsa,* a Sanskrit play. *Arthacitramaṇimāla, Setuyātrānuvarṇana* and a Sanskrit version of the Merchant of Venice by Shakespeare were compositions of his teenage. In 1878, he joined the Travancore service at the age of 18 and served as the keeper of the Palace Library (*Granthappura*) from 1878 to 1884. He became acquainted with great scholars and poets like Kerala Varma Valiya Koi Tampurān and Elattur Ramaswami Sastri. He was appointed as a Sanskrit teacher at Govt. Sanskrit College, Trivandrum in 1889, the year in which the college was founded. Later on he was promoted as Headmaster and in 1899 he rose to the position of Principal of the college keeping with him the charge of the *Granthappura.*

He became full-time Curator of the Oriental Manuscripts Library in 1908 and devoted a major part of his activities for the composition of Sanskrit poems and text books. He tried his best to satisfy the desires of the Maharaja by re-vitalising Sanskrit studies through the collection of Manuscripts and the publication of new works. The series of publication which went on regularly later became famous as the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series (TSS). He had collected about 1400 Mss. of rare works and edited with learnt introduction the first 87 books of the TSS.

He proved himself as a versatile scholar proficient in *Veda*, *Śāstra*, Kāvya, Alaṅkāra, *Vyākaraṇa*, Music, Architecture, Buddhism, Jainism and so on through his publications. His edition of *Arthaśāstra* with his own commentary on it called *Śrīmūlam,* utilizing an old Malayalam commentary gained him fame from every quarters. The discovery of the Mss. of the so called Bhasa plays and their publication brought international reputation to him, the first Curator of the library.

Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa and *Samarāṅgaṇa sūtradhāra* were edited by him. The first book, a Buddhist Tantric work helped Dr. K.P. Jayaswal to bring out so many interesting historical information. *Samarāṅgaṇa-sūtradhāra* of king Bhoja edited for Gaekwad Oriental Series by Ganapathi Sastri is a treasure house of knowledge on Indian arts, crafts and machines of domestic and military use.

His works

Ganapathi Sastri was a gifted poet. *Arthacitramaṇimālā* is a work on rhetoric wherein the merits of Visakham Tirunal Maharaja are eulogized as illustrations. *Setuyātrānuvarṇana* is a prose narration of the pilgrimage to Rāmeśvaram in which he criticized the social evils of the day. *Śrīmūlacarita* a poem that describes the history of Travancore during the reign of Śrīmūlam Tirunal. *Bhāratavarṇanam* is a poem describing India. *Tulāpuruṣadāna* is on the Tulābhāra ceremony in the palace. *Aparṇāstava* is a stotra on goddess Parvati. *Cakravartinīguṇamaṇimālā* is a garland of verses on Queen Victoria.

He was honoured by an invitation in 1918 to preside over the All India Oriental Conference at Allahabad. The British Government honoured him in the same year with the title of Mahāmahopādhyāya.

In 1920 took place a rather rare function in his honour. Representative Oriental Scholars from the American Oriental Society, Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland and the Societe Asiatique of France met in Paris and presented an address to Sastri praising his contributions to research. Among the signatories to this address were veteran Orientalists like Macdonnel, A.B. Keith, Pargiter, F.W. Thomas, Grierson, Barnett, Rapson,Emile Senart, Sylvain Levi, Louis Finot, Jules Bloc, Bloomfield, Norman Brown and Lanman. Sastri was also now elected as Honorary Member of the Royal Asiatic

Society of Great Britain and Ireland. In 1924, the Tubingen University honoured him with a Doctorate Degree." In 1925, Dr. Sastri retired from active service and passed away on 3rd April 1926. His portrait was unveiled by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan at 6.30 p.m. on the 30th March 1949 in the premises of the library in the presence of a very vast and distinguished audience.

"His work as a scholar, as a editor, as a critic has received not only admiration from his collegues in India but also respect and recognition from abroad. Pandit Ganapati Sastri by his discoveries, publications and critical commentaries, has added valuable data for the comprehensive cultural history of our country."

BHĀSA PROBLEM

Dr. K. Kunjunni Raja

Much has been written about the Bhāsa problem since 1910 when Mr. T. Ganapatiśāstri announced to the world the discovery of 13 Plays which he attributed to the pre-Kālidāsa playwright Bhāsa. Kālidāsa mentions him as a great dramatist. Bāṇa mentions him as the author of several plays began by the Sūtradhāra and having many characters. Daṇḍin also refers to him as a writer of plays. Vākpatirāja's Gauḍāvaho speaks of him as a friend of 'fire', probably referring to the Lāvāṇaka fire in Svapnavāsavadatta. In a verse attributed to Rājas'ekhara in Jalhana's Sūktimuktāvalī, the Svapnavāsavadatta is praised as the one which survived a fire-ordeal. These so-called Bhāsa plays were published by Ganapatiśāstri with his own commentary. Structural similarities pointed out by Śāstri could be due to the Kerala stage; for we found some of the features in Kerala MSS of Śākuntala, Nāgānanda and Bhagavadgīta. The term *sthāpanā* being used for *prastāvanā*, the beginning *nāndyante tataḥ praviśati sūtradhāraḥ*, the epilogue *imām sāgaraparyantām* etc.).

Ganapatiśāstriś claim was greeted with enthusiasm by western Indologists like Keith and F.W. Thomas. Winternitz was carried away by the enthusiasm of Keith. Barnett was skeptical. Kerala scholars like Āttur Krishna

Pisharoti, K. Ramapisharoti and C.Kunhan Raja were not concerned about the genuiness of the drama. They knew that most of these plays were being staged in the temples of Kerala by the Cakyar and Nambyar communities for hundreds of years, and Mss. of these plays and stage-manuals (Āṭṭaprakaras) were available with the Cākyār families etc. Ganapatisastri's claim, as a new discovery was treated by these scholars as a sort of publicity stunt. A.D. Pusalkar wrote a comprehensive, Pro - Bhasa work on the problem. Dr. Woulner translated the plays into English. C.R. Devadhar whose *Plays Ascribed to Bhasa* is also a detailed study.

There is enough evidence to show that the present Svapnavasavadatta is a version, probably a Kerala version of the genuine work of Bhasa. Many of the situations described in works on rhetoric as occurring in the works of Bhasa's Svapnavasavadatta are found in the present play. One of the verses quoted by Saradatanaya as occurring in the Svapnavasavadatta is found in it without referring to his name.

चिरप्रसुप्तः कामो मे वीणया प्रतिबोधितः।
तां तु देवीं न पश्यामि यस्या घोषवती प्रिया।।

At the same time there are many verses quoted as from the Svapnavasavadatta are not found in the printed text.

स्वञ्चितपक्ष्मकवाटं नयनद्वारं द्वारं स्वरूपताडेन।

उद्घाटय सा प्रविष्टा हृदयगृहं मे नृपतनूजा।।

quoted by Abhinavagupta.

यथा भासकृते स्वप्नवासदत्ते शेफालिका शिला तल्पमवलोक्य वत्सराजः-

पादाक्रान्तानि पुष्पाणि सोष्मचेदं शिलातलम्
नूनं किञ्चिदिहासीना मां दृष्ट्वा सहसा गता।।

Dr. Unni has pointed out that the verse स्वञ्चितपक्ष्मकवाटं is found quoted in Alankaramahodadhi of Narendraprabhasuri with minor changes in the reading; last line being देहगृहं सा हृदयचौरी and the beginning सञ्चित.

Ganapatisastri's claim that the anonymous plays were found with Svapnavasavadatta manuscripts is meaningless. There are many bundles containing well known classical palys like Bhagavadajjuka, Nāgānanda, Mattavilasa, Aścaryacūḍāmaṇi etc. of known authers. The Ramayana trilogy - Cūḍāmaṇi, Pratimā and Abhiṣeka are found together in many bundles. Even the Manalikkara bundle on which Sastri started his claim might have contained some well known play of known authors (one reason for its disappearance).

Winternitz, stand on the Bhasa problem needs special mention. In the beginning he was carried away by the enthusiasm of scholars like Keith and F.T. Thomas. But his statement was careful. Even in the Souvenir of

Trivandrum Mss. Library; even if it should be finally proved that Bhasa cannot be the author of these plays, they will have to be counted among the most valuable treasure of Indian literature. His final view was published in his paper in the Woolner volume 1940. There he stated clearly that each play must be examined and discussed separately, since the differences among the plays are much more than the similarities. Dr. Unni has not referred to that article.

Prof. C. Kunhan Raja published a paper 'Some Unexplained Prakrit Passage and their Bearing on the Bhasa Problem, (JOR, Madrass I), where he drew attention to some Malayalam words in Bhasa (neyyappamanam etc). I have published a paper drawing the attention of scholars to a probable Malayalam word in Abhisekanāṭaka (Act IV)

अस्ताद्रिमस्तकगतःप्रतिसंहृतांशुः
सन्ध्यानुरतञ्जीवपुः प्रतिभाति सूर्यः।
रक्तोज्वलांशुकवृते द्विरदस्यकुम्भे
जाम्बूनदेनरचितः पुलको यथैव।।

Editors and translators had difficulty on the word *Pulaka* and its meaning (golden mark). The term *Pulaka* must mean 'a bubble' or 'a hollow hemispherical cup'. Mahakavi Vallathol's translation reads thus.

astādritanmukalilāy vilasunnusandhyā

raktābha cernnukiraṅṅal kurañja sūryan

caṭṭattorānayuṭe cenniramāya netti

ppaṭṭattilminnumoruponkumiḷakku tulyam

Pulaka seems to be the Sanskritised form of Malayalam *'Poḷa'*. This is a minor point

Regarding the relation between (Daridra) Cārudatta and Sudraka's Mṛcchakaṭikā, the close similarity is unquestionable. The problem is which is the original and which the borrower. Some like A.K. Warder assume that Mṛcchakaṭikā is later than Carudatta. one argument is based on the prakrit used by Sūtradhāra in the Mrcchakaṭika. The Sutradhara Starts in Sanskrit and then changes into Prakrit with the defence - कार्यवशात् प्रयोगवशाच्च प्राकृतवादी संवृत्तः। Sutradhara appearing as dressed up in the form of one of the main characters is a regular feature in the Kerala stage direction. No Mss. of Mṛcchakaṭika is available in Kerala.

We have no direct proof for Bhasa's authorship of any of the plays except perhaps for Svapnavasavadatta. The study of the medieval texts Śākuntalacarcā (also anonymous) shows that the so called Bhasa plays remained anonymous.

The Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa is structurally connected with the Svapnavasavadatta, and Dr. Unni is in favor of taking it as a genuine work, since Bhāmaha's criticism seems direct towards it. But on close

examination, it is found that special effort has been made to answer Bhāmaha's criticism, showing that it is post Bhamaha. We have no direct proof for the authorship of the Trivandrum plays except Svapnavasavadatta. The discussion in the Sakuntalacarca shows that at that time they remained anonymous. Most of the Mss. examined by N.P. Unni show that the prologue does not give the name of the playwright. He has noticed one of the Mss. of Avimāraka refers to the work as that of Kātyāyana. This may be used against Bhasa's authorship of the work, but it does not prove Katyayana's authorship.

In the case of one version of Mahānāṭaka or Hanumannāṭaka we know that some manuscripts refer to its author as Bodhāyana while others give the name of the playwright as Immaḍidevarāja. In the case of Bhagavadajjuka also the name of the author given as Bodhāyana is not free from doubts, since Bhagavadajjuka and Mattavlāsa are mentioned together in a Pallava inscription. Dr. Unni refers to a verse where the son of a Brahmin named Sankara wrote Bhagavadajjukīya and Dūtavākya. The term *vyalikhat* used shows that he was only a scribe (as Dr. Unni concedes).

The problem becomes more confusing since in Somadevasūriś Yaśastilakacampū (10^{th} century A.D) a verse occurring in Mahendravikramaś Mattavilāsa is quoted ascribing it to Mahākavi Bhāsa.

पेया सुरा प्रियतमामुखमीक्षितव्यं
ग्राह्यःस्वभावललितो विकृतश्च वेषः।
येनेयमीदृशमदृश्यत मोक्ष भवर्त्मा।
दीर्घायुरस्तु भगवान् स पिनाकपाणिः।।

This mattavilāsa is one of the plays staged by cākyārs.

Naṭāṅkuśa, on Kerala staging of Sanskrit plays, now published by Paulose deserve some mention. The attempt to edit has a history of its own. Dr. Raghavan wanted to edit it, but found that his familiarity with the Kerala stage and Malayalam stood in the way. M.S. Menon who had come to the Presidency College was given the work for his Ph.D thesis. When he had to come to Kerala after the linguistic redistribution of India, that could not be continued. I got interested in it, but when Vasudevan of Killimaṅgalam with his intimate knowledge of the Kūṭiyāṭṭam came forward to do it,and got a fellowship with the help of Dr. Kapilaji. I tried to help him in modern textual criticism and critical editing. Whenever any doubt occured to him he would go to his uncle, who was a Professor in Brahmasvam Maḍham. After the death of his uncle, his enthusiasm also became less. But he helped a prince of Kochin who was working on the topic for his Ph.D. He got his degree, but the critical edition was not ready. I wrote several papers on different aspects of Kūṭiyāṭṭam and the role of Naṭāṅkuśa. Dr. Unni was also working in the problem in his own way. Then Dr. Paulose took an interest on the problem,

and getting the co-operation of all prepared a good edition and published it. Scholars had also added confusion to the problem of the author. The first line महीमा स जयत्येको made M. Krishnamachari to assign it to Mahimabhaṭṭa. Our work is several centuries later. K. Narayanapisharoti wrote to latter saying according to one tradition Uddaṇḍa śāstri was its author; Ullur said so in his Sāhityacaritra. Later the same Nārāyaṇa Pisharoti said the suggestion of tradition he had given to Ullur is not correct, 'more reliable' tradition is that it is by a member of Kūḍallūr family. The attitude of the auther towards Cākyār shows that it cannot be a Cākyār (as suggested by vaṭakkumkūr); cannot be Uddaṇḍa who was a Tamil Brahmin. The similarity of the attitude towards Cākyārs and attack on their reckless innovations found in Naṭāṅkuśa is found in Śakuntalacarcā also, and the possibility of the identity of their authorship was raised by me. There was a tradition that a member of Kuḍallūr wrote commentary on the Śākuntala. Hence both were tentatively ascribed to that member. But I came across an anonymous commentary of Śākuntala called Anvayabodhika; there he quotes from his grandfather's Bhāṣya on Visṇusahasranāma. This shows that the Kuḍallūr tradition, if genuine, must be to the Anvayabodhikā. It seems in a Ms. dated 1941, the scribe wrote that it is by a Payyūr Bhaṭṭa. Dr. Paulose took it seriously and made his suggestion that Naṭāṅkuśa is by Vasudeva II of Payyūr family, a contemporary of Uddaṇḍaśāstri. Dr. Unni's note on Naṭāṅkuśa given in the

edition says, 'The legitimate conclusion is that the author in anonymous (p.16). Dr. Paulose also wants more evidence to establish his view. In a recent review of the book Dr. K.H. Subrahmanyan says that rejecting all earlier views, Dr. Paulose has established that Vasudeva II is the author'. He says in my Introduction I have not said any thing, except that the Carcā and the Naṭāṅkuśa might be by the same author. There have been several Nambūtiri scholars who could have written it. The view Kūḍallūr Nambūtiri was that author cannot stand since, another commentary, the Anvayabodhikā, is by a member of Kūḍallūr. None can prove that any member of Payyūr family was not the author. But the similarity of style is doubtful; and 1941 tradition seems unconvincing. The Nambūtiris were used to be the object criticism on the stage and none objected to it. Even Ex. Highness Rama Varma of Cochin was asked by a Cākyār on the stage "Did you retire or were you forced to retire?" "ഒഴിഞ്ഞതോ ഒഴിപ്പിച്ചതോ?"

BHĀSA PROBLEM AGAIN

Dr.N.P.Unni

Much has been written about the Bhāsa problem. Till 1910 AD when T.Ganapati Sastri announced the "Discovery" of 13 plays attributing them to Bhāsa, all that scholars knew about the great dramatist was confined to some references in literature. Scholars have contributed papers dealing with the various aspects of the issue. In recent times a few authoritative writers dealt the problem with a renewed interest[1]. Those who staunchly supported the views of the pro- Bhāsa theory felt it uneasy to reject the view altogether, though they began to express some doubts. Such writers again propounded the theory that the Trivandrum plays are definitely by Bhāsa, but what we have at present are versions or rather adaptations with minor changes. The arguments of Ganapati Sastri for the theory of single authorship to these works could not be overthrown overnight and hence they wanted some adjustments.

When it was pointed out that a manuscript of *Avimāraka* - about 3 to 4 centuries old - contained a remark by the scribe that there is a tradition that it was composed by Kātyāyana, some entertained disbelief. To them the "assertion" of Ganapati Sastri is more authentic than the "unreliable" statement of a disinterested scribe

---

[1] N.P.UNNI, Bhasa A fresh, Nag publishers, Delhi - 2000.

who never expected a controversy a few centuries later, on the authorship. Such writers were willing to "admit" that "Kātyāyana" could very well be a family name of Bhāsa, for which there is no shred of evidence. The present writer tried to establish only that these plays could not be by a single author.[2] As far as *Avimāraka* is concerned it is not definitely by Bhāsa. This view has gained acceptance at the hands of serious, dispassionate and unbiased scholars.

During the last two decades, scholars of two different breed contributed to the problem. The first category belonged to the popular school who 'believed' that Bhāsa was the author of the whole series and produced books dealing with the social, historical, cultural and other aspects of the issue, as of before. They had before them the monumental work of Pusalker which covered all these aspects most competently. Prof.V.Venkatachalam wrote his popular book based on the same presumption and he has openly admitted that he does not want to refer to these plays every now and then as "so-called Bhāsa plays". Even University teachers and their research students continued to proceed along these lines without caring for new findings on the problem.

Three important works have shed some light on the Trivandrumplays. They are (i)The *Abhijñānaśākuntalacarcā* of

---

[2] New problems in Bhasa plays, College Book House, Trivandrum, 1978, pp. 94-107.

anonymous authorship published in the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series. This contains a mine of information on these plays in the form of quotations which are traceable. In fact it is the first work to include so much quotations. Seven of the thirteen plays are quoted therein. They are (1) *Avimāraka* (2) *Bālacarita,* (3) *Svapnavāsavadattā*, (4) *Kavacadāna* (identified with *Karṇabhāra*), (5) Cārudatta, (6) *Pañcaratra* and (7) *Dūtaghaṭotkaca*. (ii) The second work which contained traceable reference is *Naṭāṅkuśa* - a critique on the Kūṭiyāṭṭam style of performance by an anonymous author. (iii) The third work is *Paryāyapadāvalī* of Vasudeva of Payyūr which quotes from *Pratimānāṭaka*.

All these three works are of Kerala origin and could be dated between 15th and 16th centuries A.D. Anybody who has carefully gone through these quotations would find it difficult to believe in the theory of common authorship to them. Further nobody with a balanced approach could ascribe some of them, to a great dramatist of the stature of Bhāsa. Some of the remarks offered by the anonymous Kerala author of the *Śākuntala* commentary is sarcastic in posing questions. Regarding an adapted version of *Karṇabhāra* according to him the *Kavacadāna* - it is observed: "*Nanu Kavacadāne Sūtradhāreṇa asūcitasya bhaṭasya praveśodṛśyate. Satyam. Katham nāmāyam bhaṭaḥ sūtradhāreṇa sūcito bhavet yavatā atra sūtradhāra eva*

nāsti. Tadetad adbhutam yad rūpakam sūtradhāra-prasaṅgād vinā samutthitam iti". At least two manuscripts of the play (MS.No:3168 E and 22848 J of the Kerala University Manuscripts Library) begins with the statement:

"Tatah praviśati bhaṭaḥ. Bho ! Bho! Nivedyatām Mahārājāya".

If the characteristic of a play is *"Sūtradhārakṛtārambha"* as propounded by Bāṇabhaṭṭa in his Harṣacarita how could one reconcile with the above situation ? Here is a statement of a *Śākuntala* commentator supported by two palm leaf manuscripts which are at least 300 - to 400 years old.

Of course the Trivandrum printed edition contains Sūtradhāra and the benedictory stanza. This I have quoted only to show the value of the commentary as regards the problem of so-called Bhāsa plays. *Dūtaghaṭotkaca* is also quoted and propriety questioned as regards certain dramatic conventions.

I am glad to note that these and other points highlighted by the present author were looked into by some competent scholars whose views are quoted and discussed in this section.

Among the second category of scholars may be included Prof.M.C.Byrski, Prof.H.Tieken, Prof.Bruckner and Prof. M.P. Śankunni Nair. They have dealt with the problem taking into notice all research materials

available on the issue. The present writer had the privilege of discussing the problem with the above-mentioned scholars. It is a privilege of the present writer to deliver lectures on the issue at the University of Hydelburg at the invitation of Prof.K.P.Aithal; at the University of Marburg at the invitation of Prof.Michael Hahn; and at Tubingen at the instance of Prof.Bruckner. He also delivered a series of three lectures at the Karnātaka University of Dharwad (Published under the title *'New Perspectives on Bhāsa Studies'*) in the presence of Dr.K.Krishnamurthy[3] who noted in his foreword to the book that "he (Unni) has substantiaily proved that at least one play - *Avimāraka* was from the pen of an author other than Bhāsa. In the light of vast testimonial from Kerala commentaries, etc, he has opened up a new vista pointing to the fact that excepting the complementary plays of *Svapna* and *Pratijñā*, the other eleven plays are possibly works of different authors at different times written especially for the Kerala stage. Thus it is a landmark in the history of Bhāsa studies and it is hoped that it will win scholarly attention which it richly deserves".

Prof.Tapasvi Nandi (Ahmedabad) while contributing a paper on 'the authorship of Malavikāgnimitram' has made some casual observation about the present author's work on the Bhāsa problem. Dealing with *Cārudatta* and *Mṛcchakaṭika* he observes that "all the

---

[3] Karnatak University ,Dharwad, 1983.

efforts of scholars taken together cannot establish that both the plays were penned by one and the same person and that the one was positively earlier than the other. Prof.Unni's efforts have revealed the hollowness of those who passionately advocated single authorship and then that of Bhāsa of the thirteen Trivandrum plays. So our logical conclusion could lead us only to the finding of parallel expressions, but not to identical authorship."[4] In the same paper the learned professor has made another observation on a connected issue. "The *Bharatavākya* is also usual. It bears similarity with some of those in the so-called Bhāsa plays, the antiquity of which is thrashed by out friend Prof.Unni".[5] In reopening a problem connected with Kālidāsa, he passes a remark as true researcher that "if it is taken as worthy of some consideration, then in terms of medical science, we may say that we have been successful on re-opening the wound".

In the following pages the salient features of the views of some of the writers are noted. They are in no way complete or comprehensive. Still to make the issue up-to-date one has to go through them.

At the very out set Prof.V.Venkatachalam[6] has stated that his attempt is "to strike the happy balance

---

[4] Prof.Tapasvi Nandi 'The authorship of Malavikagnimitram' *Kalidasa-Afresh* (S.N.Rath Felicitation Volume), Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1997, p.204.

[5] *Ibid*.p.211.

[6] Prof.V.Venkatachalam Bhasa, Sahitya Academi, New Delhi, 1986

between the interests of the general reader and the demands of the more serious student of literature" and "if at all the scales have tilted at any time it has mostly been in favour of the general reader." The book is conceived taking the view that "I am a pro-Bhasite and subscribe to the genuineness of the thirteen plays as we have them now."[7] Making a passing notice regarding the Bhāsa problem he has noted that" be it as it may, this vivacious controversy - which occasionally did become vitriolic - proved to be a blessing in disguise for the newly reborn Bhāsa. Bhāsa studies gained a fresh impetus and a new momentum some of the best intellects analysed every part and directed every piece of Bhāsa's writings with all the incisive penetration and critical acumen they were capable of. This was a distinct gain for Bhāsa scholars, for in this process, nothing escaped the microscopic scrutiny of the minutest limbs in the anatomy of the reborn Bhāsa.[8] Taking M.M.Kuppuswami Sastri of the anit-Bhasite school he has quoted as follows. "In this connection, it must be stated, though it may be looked upon as an act of impious heresy, that the arguments so far advanced with reference to the Bhāsa controversy by the learned editor of the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series and those who have swallowed some of his views are jejune and inconclusive and, in some places, wholly untenable." It is further noted that "Kuppuswamy Sastri

[7] Preface p.IX
[8] *Ibid*, p.15

also lent the weight of his highly respected authority and welcomed approvingly the suggestion made by a Keralite scholar, to rename the *Bhāsanāṭakacakra* as *Kerala-nāṭakacakra* or *Cākyārnāṭaka - Cakra* and sounded a clear warning, although well-intentioned to scholars" regarding the genuineness of these plays.

Taking A.D Pusalker as Pro-Bhasite he quotes the views approvingly as follows: "Thus all the above arguments would strongly and conclusively establish, it is hoped, that these plays are original compositions and cannot be called compilation or adaptation by any amount of provincialism or flight of imagination. Minor changes are inevitable and might have been introduced by the Cākyārs for conveniences of the stage. But that does not rob Bhāsa of the authorship of these plays".

Prof.Venkatachalam relies on the 'Judgement' of Mr.A.S.P.Iyer as pronouncing the final verdict in favour of Bhāsa's authorship. "The great judge-who incidentally, also hailed from Kerala - gives the Keralite Cākyārs their due for having carefully preserved the classical dramas of Bhāsa in their Malayalam script but insists that the Cākyār could be nothing more than caretakers of Bhāsa's work. The Bhāsa authorship case has thus been taken, as it were, to the bar of a Highcourt and settled in favour of Bhāsa.[9] Anyway he considers, at least for the purpose of this popular study that the controversy is closed and

---

9. *Ibid.*p.17

settled in favour of Bhāsa and that the thirteen plays in their present form are the genuine and authentic works of Bhāsa.

Making mention of the present writer's first edition of '*New Problems in Bhāsa Plays*' the learned scholar has offered the following remarks in a footnote.[10] "The book, which could not be utilised for the present monograph completed in 1979, contains interesting information hitherto not well-known outside Kerala about staging of Sanskrit plays on the indigenous Kerala stage. Dr.Unni has also compiled and presented an exhaustive survey of all available Ms.material on the thirteen plays. One Ms.of *Avimāraka* is noticed by Dr.Unni to have an additional verse at the end, which probably mention a certain Kātyāyana (!) Th mutilated line reads Kā-yanena likhitam' and Dr.Unni fills up the lacuna with 'tyā' restores it as Kātyāyana and identifies him with the grammarian Vararuci, who is believed to be identical with the author of one of the Bhanas in the well-known *Caturbhāṇi.* Dr. Unni questions the ascription of *Avimāraka* to Bhāsa on the strength of this verse. He is, moreover disposed to accepting *Svapnavāsavadattā* and *Pratijñāyaugandharayaṇa* as genuine Bhāsa plays and pleads for further research to decide the case of the other plays. However, the wisdom of this attribution of this solitary play of the group to Kātyāyana on the strength of a lone Ms.removed from

[10] *Ibid*, p.166.

time by many centuries and the question of his age and identity need further Agniparīkṣa."

Prof.Venkatachalam has summed up the views of the present writer in a succinct manner. But then obsessed as he is with the theory of common authorship, he could not think of taking away just one play out of the group. As regards the manuscripts all of them are removed from the original author by several centuries. The fact is that a disinterested scribe who lived some three to four centuries ago has recorded a tradition regarding the authorship. In the case of the ascription by Ganapati Sastri the common authorship is only an assertion on certain grounds some of which are genuine while others are not so genuine. The learned Professor has not mentioned the fact that *Abhijñānaśakuntalacarcā* - an anonymous commentary on *Sakuntala* quotes from seven of the thirteen plays and makes incongruities in them. This commentary is definitely by a Kerala author. A second work to quote from one of the Trivandrum plays is *Paryāyapadāvalī* of Vāsudeva. The third work in this category is *Naṭānkuśa* - a critique in the staging of the plays which contains references to *Pratijñā* (*Mantrānka*) and *Avimāraka* (reference to the heroine Kurangi)

In a volume dealing with some aspects of Sanskrit Literature Dr.Vijayan has included a paper 'A note on the authorship of *Avimāraka*'. Under the caption of 'a recent view' the present author's views are discussed

with reference to the colophon found in a manuscript of *Avimāraka.* One of the observation is as follows:[11] "Dr.Unni reads the word as Kātyāyana and goes on to say that the scribe is recording a tradition according to which Kātyāyana was spoken of as the author of the piece. He sets aside the possibility of Kātyāyana to be just another name or even a family name of Bhāsa to whom the drama is ascribed at present". The present author is astonished by the import of the second sentence. T.Ganapati Sastri or no other scholar till date has suggested that Bhāsa had a family name as Kātyāyana or just an alternative name. On the face of it, a word like Kātyāyana could be a family name. But it can very well be a personal name like Bodhayana, Badarayana etc.

Another observation is as follows: "*Abhijñāna-śākuntalacarcā* supposed to have been produced in Kerala refers to one *Avimāraka.* But it is silent about its author, and the details given there also remain inapplicable to the play published in the name of Bhāsa. In the absence of any positive evidence, to speak of a tradition attributing *Avimāraka* to Kātyāyana and advocating its prevalence in Kerala are just fanciful." It may appear from this observation that the said commentary has dealt with the play in detail. The fact is that it contains only a single reference to the play with

[11] K.Vijayan, Facets of Sanskrit Literature, Trivandrum,1990

regard to the nomenclature of prologue. The reference is as follows. *"Nāgānanda - Cūḍāmaṇiprabhṛtau naṭyā śaha sūtradhāreṇa kṛtā sūcanā sthāpanetyucyate, natvāmukhamiti, kvacidevamapyucyate yathā avimārakasamvaraṇādau"*. This lone reference is just to the name of the play. As suggested by the writer there are no details in the commentary to substantiate his claim. Yet another observation is as follows. "Dr.Unni takes *Avimāraka* to have been composed by Kātyāyana Vararuci on the strength of the reading of a colophon inserting a letter in it in one of its manuscripts. An examination of the same reveals that the stanza cannot come from a competent pen and that Kātyāyana the grammarian cannot be the author of *Avimāraka.*" Again he has repeated an earlier statement *"Abhijñānaśākuntalacarcā,* a work supposed to have been produced in Kerala, refers to *Avimāraka,* but does not mention the name of its author and the details given therein remains inapplicable to the drama published in the name of Bhāsa." The answer is, the colophone is not by a competent author, but by an ordinary scribe who does not claim any scholarship. Hence the observation that it is not by a competent pen is irrelevant. As to the second part I too have to repeat to say that the *Śākuntala* commentary does not contain details as suggested by the writer, but only the reference to the name alone as quoted above. Hence the statement that "details given therein remain inapplicable" is simply misleading.

Professor M.C.Byrski[12] has made an analysis of the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa and the Svapnavāsavadattā. He has explained the rationale behind this attempt as follows.[13] "Since both dramas written by one playwright have a common subject drawn from one source, they can be studied jointly and such a study may reveal reason why one was conceived a Nāṭaka and another one a Prakaraṇa. One of them styled in the prologue a Prakaraṇa does not fulfil the requirements of its definition so far as the number of acts goes, thus offering an additional chance to show the utility of our criteria in explaining this fact".

Ms.KA obtained by T.Ganapati Sastri from Manalikkara mathom contains a colophon *Pratijñānāṭikā avasitā*. In the survey of manuscripts given by the present writer it may be seen that one more manuscript (Ms.No.22848 B) refers to the work in the colophon as *Pratijñānāṭikā*. It is pointed out by Byrski that this ascription is not in tune with the statement of the dramatist who claims it to be a Prakaraṇa. The problem is that "if we take Bhāsa's opinion for the right one, we shall find that it is an irregular type of Prakaraṇa, lacking at least one act. If in turn we consider Nāṭika as the proper designation of this play, we shall have to resort to a very strained interpretation of the text in order to show

---

[12] Maria Christopher Byrski, Methodology of the analysis of Sanskrit Drama, University of Warswa, Warswa,1979.
[13] p.18.

that it maya get the definition of Nāṭikā as it is to be formed in the Nāṭyasāstra". Bhārata maintains that there shall be more than five and upto ten acts in a Nāṭakā as well as in a Prakaraṇa. When he states "Pañcāvarā daśaparā hyaṅkāḥ syur nāṭake prakaraṇe ca"; and "Prakaraṇanāṭakaviṣaye pañcādyā daśaparā bhavat-yaṅkāḥ".

The play at hand has only four acts and hence it is difficult to be taken as a Prakaraṇa. Further the play does not have a king for its hero. Prof.Byrski has examined the problem in detail with reference to Sandhi and Sandhyaṅga. He feels that there must be some sort of omissions which in effect explain why one act is missing. "An omission of the termination element of the last span at least in its full-fledged form is responsible for the rather abrupt way in which the play ends. In this respect it has to be noted that Bhāsa does not skillfully resolve the element of mystery: The trivial- Go inside, queen, together with Padmavati; is not sufficiently balanced by the following operation. Consequently the play makes an impression that somebody has tampered with it - the only way to absolve Bhāsa of it shortcomings. The absence of the termination element, the problem of missing verse found only in the Nāṭyadarpaṇa (Pādākrāntāni Puṣpaṇi etc) and certain abruptness with which some of the motives of the play end, indicates this possibility quite strongly"[14]. The learned Professor is

---

[14] ibid p.146

of the view that the political undercurrent has been deliberately removed by Bhāsa and it is not an omission but a deliberate intention. Hence it is concluded that these "twin plays have to be a *Prakaraṇa* and a *Nāṭaka* and nothing else."[15] The conclusion arrived at by him is summed up as: (1) Pointing out of the missing act of the Pratijñā and determination of its being a Prakaraṇa and not a Nāṭika, and (2) the text has been tampered with.

Prof. Herman Tieken has independently arrived at a similar conclusion when he observes.[16] "The omission of such an essential detail would show the hand of a sloppy author. In fact, it is not the only oversight of its kind in the text".

A third scholar to share a similar view is Prof.M.P.Sankunni Nair of Kerala.[17] He is of the opinion that the present fourth Act may be the fifth Act and the missing portion is the fourth Act which might have dealt with the theme like the controlling of the elephant Nalagiri by Udayana, his teaching of lute to Vāsavadattā and other connected portions.

Referring to the first edition of the book Prof.Byrski in a letter wrote to the present author that he is going to "include your fascinating discoveries into the foreword. I have not yet read carefully your work, since

---

[15] Ibid

[16] H.Tieken, WZKS. Vol XXXVII,1993. p.20

[17] M.R.Sankunni Nair, Natyamandapam, Calicut 1987, p.206

I got it only a few day's back, but I must confess that your main arguments seem to me absolutely watertight".

Prof.Herman Tieken of Leiden[18] has published his findings on the Bhāsa problem in WZKS issued in the years 1993 and 1997. The first part of the paper was under the significant title "The so-called Trivandrum plays attributed to Bhāsa" while the second part had the title 'Three men in a row (studies in the Trivandrum plays II). The author in a footnote has suggested that the first paper may be taken as part I of the studies in the Trivandrum Plays. The present writer fully agrees with the title finally approved by the author since there is no conclusive evidence to call them as 'Bhāsanāṭakacakra'. The following points raised in these articles, deserve our attention.

(1) There is striking similarity between the plot of *Mattavilāsa* of Mahendravikrama varma with the first scene of the third Act of the *Pratijñā*. This striking similarity is to be taken into serious consideration. "In this connection the question will arise whether we have to do with a case of borrowing here and, if so what the direction of the borrowing was".

(2) "The similarity between the two plays, Pratijñā and Mattavilāsa is such (take, for instance, the figure of the Unmattaka) that the assumption of an independent

[18] Prof.Herman Tieken, *The So-called Trivandrum Plays*, WZKS, Vols:XXXVII, 1993 and XLI, 1997 pp.1-44. pp.17-52.

origin would seem highly unlikely. Rather, one should assume a case of borrowing here, in which case the question is whether Mahendravarma I borrowed the idea for his play from the Pratijñā or vice-versa.[19] This particular line of development of the plot in the text is in my opinion explained by assuming that the author of the Pratijñā derived the idea for this scene from the Mattavilāsa. In doing so he reduced the plot to the size of a sub-plot, but maintained characters and basic outline. The starting point for the 'insertion' in the Pratijñā of the particular scene adapted from Mattavilāsa may well have been the figure of the idiot, who is found in almost all other versions of the Udayana and Vāsavadattā episode".[20]

(4) "If the above argumentation concerning the direction of the borrowing is accepted, it follows that the Pratijñā in its present form cannot be earlier than Mahendravarman I's reign which is generally taken to begin around 610 A.D. It should be noted that this, then, is the first reliable date for any of the Trivandrum plays, and should as such form a starting point or a working hypothesis in any future study of these plays as a group. This would also be the case with the second conclusion which can be drawn in this connection, namely that the Pratijñā as we now have it, was written in South India".[21]

---

[19] *Ibid.* p.16.
[20] *Ibid.* p.17.
[21] *Ibid.* p.17.

(5) Prof.Tieken considers Pratijñā as a patch work and advances arguments which cannot be dismissed easily. He points out similarities between Pratijñā on the one side and Mattavilāsa and Mudrārākṣasa on the other. It is observed: "The part of the Pratijñā that remains after the play is stripped of the traces of the Mattavilāsa and the Mudrārākṣasa, is itself, too, a recast or a compilation, and as such shows traces of having been pieced together rather carelessly. All the evidence taken together would mark the Pratijñā as we now have it as a Pastiche ie., as the product of a particular way of composition rather than as the result of a gradual process of additions, insertions and alterations.[22]

(6) It is noted by Prof.Tieken that the verse quoted in *Kumārapālapratibodha* (Yadi tām caiva etc) does not agree with the context in the Trivandrum play. One has to conclude that the verse is original". This leads to the conclusion that in the *Pratijñā* two versions of the story have been combined or at least collated."[23] The first sight of Udayana and Vāsavadattā was when her palanquin stopped in front of the prison. It is assumed that during the lessons the two were kept apart by a curtain which is actually found in several other versions of the episode.[24] The omission of such an essential detail would show the hand of a sloppy author according to Tieken. The

---

[22] *Ibid.* p.19.

[23] *Ibid.* p.20.

[24] See Niti Adaval *op.cit*, pp. 86-88

existence of a curtain between the teacher and disciple could not be assumed as per the details of Svapna verse *"Bahuśopyupadeśeṣu"* etc. It is stated that during the lessons Vāsavadattā missed the strings of the lute since she was gazing at the face of her lover and she simply moved her fingers in the air.

Prof.Tieken concludes that "the *Pratijñā* in its present form answers to all the qualifications of a pastiche. This means that is not the result of a gradual accumulation of additions, insertions and alterations, but the product of a particular way of composition. It was pieced together, so to say, in one go and possibility also by one single author, on the basis of scenes, themes and motives taken from other popular texts".

(7) A significant point raised in the paper is the Pallava connections to the Kerala stage though not directly. It is averred that Pallava kings from Mahendravarman I onwards introduced Sanskrit in the South, particularly Sanskrit drama. The name *'Raṅgapatākā'* (Banner of the stage) mentioned in an inscription found in the Kailāsanātha temple as applied to a queen of one of Mahendravarman's successors, namely Parameśwaravarman I is suggestive of the royal interest in the theatrical traditions. The term 'Rājasimha' occurring in the *Bharatavākya* of seven of the so-called plays is taken to refer to the Pallava ruler Narasimhavarman II who has assumed the title of 'Rājasimha'. It is further noted that there is "a case for the

identification of Rājasimha with the Pallava King mentioned above. The argument, which consists of a string of coincidences, will be that it would be fitting if the Rājasimha mentioned in the *Pratijñā* is indeed Narasimhavarman II'.

It is already noted that LD Barnett[25] has tried to identify Rājasimha of the Trivandrum plays with the Pandya king Ter Maran Rājasimha better known as Mārāvarman Rājasimha I (740-770 A.D)

The present writer is in favour of accepting the position of Sukthankar and Kunhan Raja. The forrner is of the opinion that "the expression seems to have been held intentionally vague so that the stanza could be conveniently used on any occasion and at the court of any king".[26] The latter suggested that "the *Bharatavākya* was not the mark of the authors of the plays but a kind of motto of a group of actors.[27] The present writer had already quoted from an ancient vernacular commentary on the *Dūtavākya* that the term 'Rājasimha' connotes only 'Rājaśreṣṭha' - a great king. It does not refer to any particular king at all.

(8) Prof.Tieken has summarized his views in the following words:[28] "At the outset it has been argued that the theory that the Trivandrum plays are compilations

---

25 *JRAS* 1919.p.233
26 V.S.Sukthankar, *JBBRAS*,1925, p.139
27 C.Kunhan Raja, 211, 1923, p. 258
28 *Op. cit.*, p. 28

and adaptations made for Kūṭiyaṭṭam cannot be proved. Instead we have to reckon with the possibility that Kūṭiyaṭṭam, which goes back in Kerala at least to the tenth century, may well have adopted or inherited these texts, as scripts or as literary texts, from an earlier tradition. As such there is a prima facie case to point to the dramatic tradition brought to Tamil Nad by the Pallavas at the end of the sixth century A.D. There is clear evidence of a continuing interest within the royal family in the Sanskrit Theatre. This would, finally, suggest a solution for the nagging problem of the identification of Rājasimha or, rather, for the origin of that name".

(9) The so-called archaisms pointed out by T.Ganapati Sastri as peculiar features of Trivandrum plays are explained by Prof.Tieken with a correct perspective when he says[29] "it is possible in the South Indian Plays themselves, including those from Trivandrum to identify elements that betray a familiarity, of not a direct concern, with the tenets of the dramatic theory in general. It is not unlikely to assume that some of the peculiarities in these plays, including the so-called archaisms, have been introduced as correction or improvements. The absence of Mahārāṣṭrī Prākṛt need not be taken as suggestive of an early date of these plays."

---

[29] *Ibid*, p. 33.

(10) The last significant observation in the first of the two papers by Prof.Tieken is in his concluding remarks. He has offered a tentative date of these plays as also their place of origin. His conclusions are based mainly on a critical study of *Pratijñā - yaugandharayaṇa*. "The conclusions regarding its date (Note older than the *Mattavilāsa*), provenance (South India, Tamil Nadu) and patronage (Pallavas,, Narasimhavarman II) have provisionally been extended to the other Trivandrum plays. The fact that the Trivandrum plays form a separate group within the classical Sanskrit tradition seems indeed well-established. At the same time, however much is still unclear on this point. For instance: were the plays written within a short period of time, or are they the result of a long - established literary tradition ?[30]

(11) Prof.Tieken is fair in his observations. "The conclusions regarding the transmission of the texts within the Kūṭiyaṭṭam tradition have been based mainly on negative evidence, that is to say, so far there is no evidence of a process of adaptation of the texts by the directors or actors for the performance in Kūṭiyaṭṭam ".

(12)Representation of the first Act of *Ratnavali* described in the *Kūṭṭanīmata* of Dāmodaragupta is cited to suggest that "it would seem that the performance of one act only formed a complete programme already."[31] This idea is shared by many writers. The present writer

---

[30] *Ibid,* p.36.

[31] *Ibid,* p.37.

has shown elsewhere[32] that this is not the case with the performance mentioned in the *Kūṭṭanīmata*

Avadhīryācāryaruṣambharatoditaṣaṭkaraṇasambhūtā/

Vistāritaḥ prayogastvadavasthitivāñchayā tanvyā//.

Bhagnepi Prekṣaṇake tadanantarabhūmikāśrayāvasthāḥ/

gṛha eva niravasānam vitanoti na nāṭyadharmeṇa//

From the last sanza it is to be gathered that the performance is not limited to one act (act in the case of Kūṭiyaṭṭam performance of Kerala) though in the present case it was due to exigency. The term "*tadanantara-bhūmikāśrayāvasthāḥ*" signifies the role of the heroine occurring in the second act of *Ratnāvali* and so on. The term is explained by the commentaror as follows: *"Tasya prakṛtasya prathamāṅkasya anantarāḥ Uttarāḥ divitīyāṅ-kādibhavāḥ yā bhūmikāśrayāh svagṛhīta ratnāvalīveṣa-parigraham āśritya vartamānāḥ śeṣāḥ avasthāḥ smaraṇādivirahadaśāḥ"*. In view of this, the resemblances between the performance in Kūṭiyaṭṭam and in Kūṭṭanīmata are superficial.

(13) The present writer has not ventured to suggest any particular date or provenance for the Trivandrum palys. He shares the view that they must be late productions, and in this respect he has no objection in holding them as *post-Mattavilāsa* plays, though not for

[32] *Natyasastra*, ed.N.P.Unni, Nag Publishers, Delhi, 1998 (in 4 vols.with Eng.trans.) Introduction, p.291.

the reasons adduced by Prof.Tieken. As regarding the provenance what is to be asserted is that they happened to be preserved in Kerala rather than in South (not to be specified as Tamil Nadu). There is no reason to suggest a post - Mahendravarma tradition of South Indian theatre. For instance in the prologue of *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* of Śaktibhadra, the Naṭī expresses wonder when the Sūtradhāra says that here is a play from the South. Naṭī ventures to say that it is like "flower is produced by heaven and oil is produced from sand". This reference is a strong evidence against a flourishing tradition of Sanskrit dramas in South before Śaktibhadra.

(14) In the second part of his studies entitled 'Three men in a Row' with a sub-title 'Studies in the Trivandrum plays II' Prof. Tieken tries to find some significance of the occurrence of ' a curious set of three speakers".[33]This occurs in *Pañcarātra, Abhiṣeka, Urubhanga* and *Madhyamavyāyoga.* Similarly he has attached some significance to the usage *'Prathamaḥ Kalpaḥ'* in three of the above plays except *Pañcarātra.* Some kind of relation to *'Śrāddha'* is also sought to be established finding coincidence of the term in *Mānavadharmaśāstra and Mahābhārata.*

The present writer could not find any significance for these in connection with the Bhāsa problems and as such he is 'non-committal' to the proposal.

---

[33] Tieken, *WZKS* Vol. XCI,1997, pp.17-52.

(15) In this paper Tieken has tried to draw some parallelism between *Terukūttu* alias *Kaṭṭaikkūttū* by groups of actors at funeral ceremonies in Tamil Nadu. "If *Ūrubhanga* was indeed performed at the *Śrāddha,* this would appear to be an innovation which originated in South India. By the same reasoning *Madhyama* may have been performed at an *Upanayana ceremony*".[34] This is sheer imagination as Tieken himself has stated. "It is tempting to imagine that *Ūrubhanga* was performed at such a ceremony in South Indian house-holds." Again it is observed "the task of the author of *Ūrubhanga* seems to have been to compose a play suitable for a funeral ceremony. His handling of the epic story was in the first place determined by the purpose of setting at rest the minds of the fearful mourners".[35]

Here again the present author has not come across any such custom in South India or in Kerala.

(16) In this paper again Tieken has rightly pointed out the features of these plays including archaisms. He has rightly established that "with regard to the so-called archaisms found in the Prakṛt of the plays, it should be noted that these do not automatically point to an early date of the plays. For one thing, the same archaisms are found in other, later, South Indian plays as well, such as *Āścaryacūḍāmaṇi* and the plays of Kulaśekhara Varman."

---

[34] *Ibid.,* p.37.
[35] *Ibid,* p. 48.

It is my considered view that Prof.Tieken has made an indepth study of the whole problem from various angles. Of course there are points of agreement as well as disagreement between himself and the present writer. Still his reasonings are sound and thought provoking.

Prof. Miss Heidrun Bruckner has dealt with the Bhāsa problem in a learned paper which the present author could not evaluate. The paper entitled "Opfer ala Helden - Neue Perspektiven in den Bhāsa Dramen, St II 19, 1994 (Festschrift George Buddress (published 1995) 33 - 60., is seen discussed by Prof.Tieken in the second paper referred to above. The present writer has discussed the problem with Bruckner when he visited Tubingen after a long sojourn at Netherlands. It seems that she has commented on the chronological problems resulting from Tieken's dating of *Pratijñāyaugandharayaṇa* with reference to the *Mattavilāsa.*

Prof.Bruckner has collected copies of Bhāsa manuscripts (she even discussed some of the plays with me when I was in Tubingen) for her edition and translation in German. I am glad to note that the first edition of the present monograph could generate some fresh interest in the problems in these foreign scholars.

Among the scholars with a flair for original research may be considered Prof.M.P.Sankunni Nair[36] of the Pattambi Gurukulam tradition. In recent times he has bestowed his keen interest on the problem and he had discussed some aspects of the same with the present writer. In a paper included in one of his recent publications he has discussed the issue (in Malayalam) under thetitle'**Tiruvanantapurarūpakaṅṅal**' (Trivandrum plays). The paper contains many insights into the problem though they are scattered among the lines. The treatment is not systematic even though the observations are most important and to the point. These may be noted here since they contain hitherto unnoticed aspects of the problem regarding the Bhāsa plays. He has dealt with the problem relating to the plays at random and hence here it may be noted with reference to the plays.

(1) Reference is made to the stanzas which mention Bhāsa as a dramatist. Thus Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Dandin etc., are referred to.

(2) The word 'Bhāsa' can be seen utilised in the meanings of 'illustrious' and 'a particular blue-bird.

(3) It is noted that the following stanza occurring in Sūktimuktāvalī and assigned to the authorship of Bhāsa is suitable to the situation where Udayana is described as separated from Vāsavadattā.

---

[36] M.P.Sankunni Nair, *Tiruvanantapurarupakannal* (Trivandrum Plays) *Natyamandapam*, Mathrtubhumi, Calicut, 1987.

"*Duḥkhārte mayi duḥkhitā bhavati yā*
hṛṣṭe prahṛṣṭā tathā,
dīne dainyam upaiti roṣaparuṣe
pathyam vaco bhāṣate,.
kālam vetti kathāḥ karoti nipuṇāḥ
matsamstave rajyati
bhāryā mantrivaraḥ sakhā parijanaḥ
saikā bahutvam gatā

In this connection some stanzas from Kāvyādarśa of Daṇḍin and Kāvyālaṅkāra of Vamana also are cited as having relevance to the story of Udayana.

(4) The reason for assigning a common authorship by T.Ganapati Sastri is noted as 'they formed the part of the same codex in which *Svapnavāsavadattā* assigned by writers to Bhāsa' is found.

(5) Reference to anti-Bhāsa school is made and the failure of their effort is noted.

(6) *Svapnavāsavadattā* is noted as the best of the Trivandrum plays. The name of *'Avantisundarī'* accepted by Daṇḍin as that of the heroine of his work must have been taken from *Svapna*.

(7) Cākyārs of Kerala must have made changes in the *Pratijñā*. The present fourth Act may be treated as the fifth one. Hence the original fourth Act is really missing.

It must have contained the plot like the controlling of the elephant called Nalāgiri, teaching of lute to Vāsavadattā, meeting of Udayana, Unmattaka and Yaugandharāyaṇa. It is conjectured that the story occurring in the *Priyadarsika* (Act III *Antarnāṭaka*) must have been the plot of the missing act.

(8) The *Kumārapālapratibodha* of Somaprabha contains three stanzas as quoted anonymously. They are:.

"*Kakṣyāyam badhyamānayām yathā raśati hastinī*

Yojanānām śatam gatvā tathā prāṇān vimokṣyati

Eṣa prayāti Sārthah kāñcanamālā vasantakaścaiva,

Bhadrāvatī Ghoṣavatī Vāsavadattāpyudayanaścaiva

Yadi tām caiva tam caiva tām caivāyatalocanām.

Nāharāmi nṛpam caiva nasmi yaugandharāyaṇah

Only the last verse is found in the Trivandrum version of the play.

(9) *Mattavilāsa* is only a reflection of the *Mantrāṅka* of *Pratijñā*. (Here it may be noted that Prof.Tieken of Netherlands also holds a similar view).

(10) The name 'Cārudatta' has an echo of Cārvāka the preceptor of the heretic school.

(11) The style of expression represented in the Trivandrum play *Cārudatta* shows the unintelligence of an actor as can be gathered by the words of Sūtradhāra

and Naṭī. Sūtradhāra asks her as to who instructed her the idea of vow. The answer is given in the passive that it was instructed to her by Cūrnagostha. One who has scholarship in Sanskrit will not write like this. Here the question is in the nominative case while the answer is in the instrumental.

(12) In the extant *Ūrubhaṅga* there is a verse having a reference to the story of the stealing of Pārijāta tree by Kṛṣṇa. The verse forms the dialogue of Duryodhana. *(Yenendrasya sa pārijatakataruḥ mānena tulyam hṛtaḥ)*. It is pointed out that the story is an original concept of the author of the poem *Pārijātaharaṇa*, as is maintained by Abhinavagupta in his *Locana*. M.P.Sankunni Nair points out that the *Ūrubhaṅga* must have been written after the composition of *Pārijātaharaṇa* by Āḍhyarāja in the fourth or fifth century A.D and as such Bhāsa said to be a predecessor of Kalidasa could not have authored the play. It is also noted by Prof. Nair that Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāraprakāśa* contains two stanzas quoted from *Mukuṭatāḍitaka* (attributed to Bana) in which the following lines occur.

(1) *Pūrṇā kṛṣṇākeśabandhapratijñā*
Tiṣṭhatyekaḥ Kauravasyorubhaṅgaḥ

(2) *Ūrū nipīḍya gadayā yadi nāsya tasya*
Pādena ratnamukuṭam śakalīkaromi.

In the play there the idea that Kṛṣṇa entered the club of Bhima, an idea not to be found in the *Mahābhārata;* where the origin of the club is from Uttarakuru.

(13) Taking up the problems relating to *Bālacarita* it is noted that the benedictory stanza beginning with *'Śaṅkhakṣīravapuḥ"* contains the line:

"Dūrvāśyāmanibhaḥ sa rāvaṇavadhe

rāmo yuge dvāpare."

Accordingly Rāma flourished in the Dvāpara age and his colour was as dark-green as Dūrva grass. Abhinavagupta quotes a stanza from Bhāsa in his *Nāṭyavedavivṛti* in which Rama is mentioned as flourishing in Tretāyuga.

'Tretāyugam taddhi na maithilī sā

Rāmasya rāgapadavī, mṛdu cāsya cetaḥ'

If Bhāsa were the author of *Bālacarita* how could one conceive that he puts Rāma in the Dvāparayuga as well as Tretayuga - the second reference being authentic as coming from the pen of Bhāsa and vouchsafed by Abhinava. There is a reference to the exploits of Kārtikeya (Subrahmania) in the *Bālacarita* given as a simile.

Kamsam nihatya samare parikarṣayāmi

Tam pādapam jalanidheriva Kārtikeyaḥ.

"I shall kill Kamsa in battle and drag him about as did Kārtikeya in the case of that tree (Kadamba) which was dragged from the ocean." This story is familiar in the South and hence the reference is suggestive of a Southern origin of the play.

According to *Bālacarita,* at the time of the incarnation of Kṛṣṇa five weapons appear along with Garuda to serve on him. They are 'Śārṅga (bow), Kaumodakī (club), Śaṅkha (conch) Nandaka (sword) and Cakra (disc). Among them Śārṅga and Kaumodakī are personified in feminine gender while the others apparently belong to masculine. In *Dūtavākya* of Bhāsa Nandaka is personified as feminine as against masculine in his own work *Bālacarita.* Such a contradiction is impossible if both were the works of the same author. The concept of the five weapons is well known in *Pāñcarātra Āgamas.*

(14) Reference to the five weapons possessed of human forms is taken as suggestive of a Madhva bias by Mr.Nair. The play *Madhyamavyāyoga* also gives scope for such a theory. Mādhva's name was Vasudeva. He was often called Madhyagehabhaṭṭa and Madhyama. A line from *Sarvadarśanasamgraha* is quoted to show this idea : *"Madhyamandirena Mahābhāratatātparyanirṇaye."* The mighty Bhatta is taken as the incarnation of Vayu, Hanuman and Bhima. The name 'Keśavadāsa' given to the Brahmin also is significant. Madhva has ordained

that *"nāmakaraṇam putrādīnām Keśavādināmnā vyavahāraḥ sarvadā tannāmānusmaraṇārtham".*

(15) Dealing with *Pañcarātra,* it is suggested that the name *'Gurudakśiṇā'* as well as *'gograhaṇa'* are equally applicable to the play from the point of view of the theme. However there is no connection with Pāñcarātrāgama. The plot is conceived by the dramatist in a novel way with some deviation from the *Mahābhārata*.

(16) *Pratimā* is an interesting play. But it need not be from the pen of Bhāsa. *Kundamālā* of Dhīranāga a Southern writer, also contains reference to *Pratimā (statue). "Śuśrūṣitavyaḥ pratimāgataḥ mahārājaḥ".* It is strange that Bharata of *Pratimānāṭaka* is ignorant of the practice of erecting the statues of the departed kings of his own line.

(17) *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* and *PratimaNāaka* could not be from the pen of a single author because, of the repetition of themes though in a different way. *Avimāraka* may be considered as a weak imitation of *Mālatīmādhava.*

(18) Prof.Nair concludes stating that it is a great blunder to argue that incompatibility with the tenets of *Nāṭayaśāstra* and archaisms etc; are due to the author's antiquity. There is a popular saying that archaisms and wrong usages seek protection at the hands of the practitioners of Sanskrit dramas. To speak about the

Prakṛt language of the plays one has to take them as coming from the pen of sub-standard writers rather than claiming them as archaisms of Bhāsa - the Rsi. *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* may be from his pen, but then what we have at present are adaptations from the originals which are no more extant.

The present writer generally agrees to the above view. It is to be admitted that these views could not be dismissed without solid proof to establish otherwise.

Bhāsa's Prākṛt

Dealing with this problem Herman Tieken notes: "One of the archaisms concerns the absence of Mahārāṣṭri Prakṛt. The absence of this dialect has explicitly or implicitly, been an argument to situate the Trivandrum plays between Asvaghoṣa, who did not use Mahārāṣṭrī and Kālidāsa, the first playwright known to have used this dialect in the verses of his dramas. It should be noted, however, that this dialect is also absent from such an originally South Indian play as the *Mattavilāsa*. This means that the non-use of Maharastri was also part of a South Indian tradition of writing Sanskrit plays."[37]

Kerala Stage

The Trivandrum plays owe much to the stage tradition of Kerala for their preservation. Some of the

---

[37] Herman Tieken, WZKS 37, 1993, p. 33.

details regarding their staging are given in these pages. For want of information and evidence a complete account could not be given. Even the professional actors are not conversant with them. During the last several decades, many of these plays were not at all staged. The present writer hopes that this aspect can be further probed in future by searching for stage manuals which are almost on the verge of extinction.

Fresh assessment needed

A fresh assessment of the problem is a desideratum. Studies embracing sociological conditions, geographical aspects, laws and customs, religion, Philosophy etc; have appeared on the basis of a common authorship. When it is established that the case is different, a fresh look on these aspects will become necessary. The plays are not the products of a definite, well-marked period. On the other hand they exhibit peculiarities of different ages.

It is gratifying to note that many a scholar at national and international level shares this view. Some of them have worked further during the last two decades and have come up with valuable results which could establish different authorship. Mention may be made of serious researchers like Prof.Herman Tieken (Netherlands), Christopher Byrski (Poland), Prof.Miss. Heidrun Bruckner (Germany) and Prof.M.P.Sankunni Nair of Pattambi in Kerala. They have opened new frontiers of investigation into the Bhāsa problem and

their efforts could not be casually dismissed. Still the present writer feels that the observation of the Sakuntala commentator have not yet been assessed fully in the proper spirit. One should try to visualise the scholarship of the author or authors of these plays through the critical vision of the commentator to have a proper assessment.

In conclusion the present writer would plead for a dispassionate attempt to evaluate critically the facts presented in the foregoing pages. He is not interested in establishing that all these plays belong not to Bhāsa but to some other author or authors. It is not with an iconoclastic bent of mind that these pages were written. The great strides in classical scholarship made by Ganapati Sastri can neither be forgotten, nor be underrated. But the truth remains that the data provided by the hundreds of manuscripts unearthed and catalogued after Ganapati Sastri have not yet been subjected to critical scrutiny. When serious attempts in this direction are made, who knows, that an entirely different picture may not emerge and a new dramatic genius whose identity was lost in oblivion for all these centuries may not make his appearance on the firmament of Indian literature.

BHĀSA PROBLEM REVIEWED

Dr. K. Vijayan

Bhāsa the great poet and dramatist remained confined to a few references upto the beginning of the 20th century. Āyilyam Tirunal, the king of the erstwhile principality of Travancore made an observation that the palace collection of manuscripts included a copy of the famous play, *Svapnavāsavadatta*. But it did not occur to him to pursue the matter further. It was in A.D. 1910 M. M.T.Gaṇapatiśastri announced to the world his discovery of thirteen plays, and attributed all of them to Bhāsa. The principal grounds behind such an ascription can be summarised as follows:

1. All the dramas in the collection begin with the stage-direction नान्द्यन्ते ततः प्रविशति सूत्रधारः, unlike the practice of introducing the benedictory stanza first, and subsequently the stage-direction.

2. The prologue everywhere is called स्थापना instead of प्रस्तावना usually found in classical Sanskrit dramas (except *Karṇabhāra* which employs the term प्रस्तावना itself).

3. The practice of mentioning the name of the poet or the title of the work in the prologue of these plays is absent.

4. The last line of the *Bharatavākya* is almost the same as राजसिंहः प्रशास्तु नः, meaning 'may our mighty king continue to rule over the earth.

5. Most of the plays imply the names of the principal characters in the opening verse indicating structural unity.

6. All these dramas begin with Sūtradhāra on the stage (except चारुदत्त) and introduce various characters and episodes as stated by Bāṇa in Harṣacarita

7. Most of the stanzas cited in the name of Bhāsa or references made by subsequent writers are found in the collection ad verbum, ad sensum.

8. One of the plays in the group sharing the common features of the writings of Bhāsa is Svapna-vāsavadatta known to have been composed by Bhāsa on the authority of Rajasekhara:

   भासनाटकचक्रेऽपि छेकैः क्षिप्ते परीक्षितुम्।
   स्वप्नवासवदत्तस्य दाहकोऽभून्न पावकः।।[1]

9. Bhoja's description of some incidents in *Svapna-vāsavadatta* closely resembles the events described in the fifth Act of the text. It runs:

स्वप्नवासवदत्ते पद्मावतीमस्वस्थां द्रष्टुं राजा समुद्रगृहकं गतः। पद्मावतीरहितं च तदवलोक्य तस्या एव शयनीये सुष्वाप। वासवदत्तां

[1] Sūktimuktavali

च स्वप्नवदस्वप्ने ददर्श। स्वप्नायमानश्च स वासवदत्तामाबभाष। स्वप्नशब्देन चेह स्वापो वा स्वप्नदर्शनं वा विवक्षितम्।[2]

10. *Bhāvaprakāśa* of Śāradātanaya in its eighth *Adhikāra*, while dealing with the features of a few kinds of Rūpakas refers to *Svapnavāsavadatta*. It shows that Vāsavadatta was separated from Vatsarāja, and entrusted to Padmāvatī (as in the first Act), that Vatsarāja believed Vāsavadatta was alive (vide fifth Act), that the king feelingly called for Vāsavadattā by name, and so on (as in the fifth Act), and that the king having got the lute Ghoṣavati began to search for Vāsavadattā. The verse चिरप्रसुप्तः कामो मे.......... found in the fifth Act is actually quoted.[3]

11. Agreement with regard to technique, expression of ideas in identical words, use of *Patākāsthānaka*, identical nature of dramatic situations, common imagery, correspondence of vocabulary of expression, recurrence of stanzas and prose passages in the dramas, the use of rare metres such as *Suvadanā* and *Daṇḍaka*, sameness in the names of dramatis personae etc; help a long way towards the solution of common authorship.

12. Citations not traceable in the dramas found out can be explained away as occurring in some other

---

[2] Śṛṅgāraprakāśa, 12th Prakāśa

[3] GOS edn, NP. 40, Baroda, pp. 238-39.

dramas penned by the author or lost in the course of transmission.

Authorship disputed:

The authenticity of the common authorship of the thirteen plays ascribed to Bhāsa has been thus argued out by Śāstri, and he published all of them in the name of Bhāsa within three years from the date of discovery (1912-15). A vast majority of scholars both Indian and foreign express their agreement regarding the ascription of the plays to Bhāsa. They also fortify the stand taken by Śāstri with fresh arguments.

RāmāvatāraŚarma, BhaṭṭanāthaSvāmi, Barnet, Krisṇapiṣāroti, Rāmapiṣāroti and a few others are not convinced of the genuineness of the claim of Śāstri. The arguments put forward against the ascription are collected by Śāstri himself and he has examined them in detail.[4] He sets aside all the views contrary to the one he sticks to.

As it is natural a number of scholars differ, and the problem of authorship of the plays ascribed to Bhāsa is still debated. It is a sorry spectacle that those who argue against common authorship do not assign these plays to anyone else. It appears to be reasonable to hold the view that whoever has written these dramas be Bhāsa

---

[4] *Bhāsa plays*, Trivandrum, 1925, pp. 80-122.

considering the description of the poet as the smile of the muse of poetry, भासो हासः[5]

A recent view

Dr. Unni has recently advanced on the strength of a manuscript preserved in the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library of the University of Kerala that *Avimāraka*, one among the thirteen plays is written by Kātyāyana, otherwise known as Vararuci. The arguments presented by him can be summarised as follows.

The colophon of the manuscript[6] containing a stanza written by an anonymous scribe ascribes the work *Avimāraka* to Kātyāyana.

> एतत् पुरा कविवरप्रवरेण तेन
> का.... यनेन रचितं चरितं रसेन।
> सौवीरराजचरितं हरिसेननाम्नो
> नाम्नाविमारकमिदं लिखितं समाप्तम्।।

As is required by the metre the second line of the stanza should have one more letter.[7] Dr. Unni reads the word as 'Kātyāyana' and goes on to say that the scribe is recording a tradition according to which Kātyāyana was spoken of as the author of the piece. It sets aside the

---

[5]यस्याश्चोरश्चिकुरनिकुरः कर्णपूरो मयूरो
भासो हासः कविकुलगुरुः कालिदासो विलासः।
हर्षो हर्षो हृदयवसतिः पञ्चबाणस्तु बाणः
केषां नैषा भवति कविताकामिनी कौतुकाय।।
Jayadeva, *Prasannarāghava,* I. 22.

[6] No.5150A Collcted from Vaikom in the State of Kerala.

[7] The manuscript is written in Malayalam Characters.

possibility of Kātyāyana to be just another name or even a family name of Bhāsa to whom the drama is ascribed at present.[8] He identifies this Kātyāyana with the great grammarian Vararuci marrying girls from all the eighteen castes, and consequently being treated as *Śvapaca* or *Caṇḍāla*. It is also stated that it is a fate shared by the hero of the play, *Avimāraka*. He finds nothing wrong in accepting the evidence of the verse of the scribe as connected by him and feels indignant that the original author Kātyāyana is not given the credit due to him.[9] He wonders why nobody is bothered to look for further manuscript copies of the so-called Bhāsa plays even after the great controversy over the Bhāsa problem has errupted and has assumed such magnitude, and finds fault with the present scholars who contribute papers on the subject confining that attention only to the printed versions of the text available to them.[10]

The View examined

All these arguments and statements are based on the contents of an extraneous stanza incorporated into the manuscript after copying the work in its entirety which again is read supplementing a letter. A perusal of the verse reveals the inability of the scribe even in versification that mars its authenticity. The compound

---

[8] *Bhāsa Afresh,* Delhi, 2001.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Ibid.

word कविवरप्रवरेण contains two superlatives serving no special purpose in the context. The word रसेन does not qualify the work, and stands in apposition to the word रचितं depriving the sense of seriousness one should have in the making of a literary piece. Having failed to accommodate the name of the hero, Viṣṇusena, in keeping with the requirements of the metre adopted the author of the verse changes it into Harisena, a liberty he ought not have taken in the case of a proper noun. The expression चरित is repeated in सौवीरराजचरितम्। लिखितं has no subject in the verse. The part लिखितं समाप्तं is rather confusing. It does not clarify whether the drama has come to a close or the process of writing the same. The import of the words पुरा and तेन also remain rather loosely connected. How is it possible to depend on such a stanza in arriving at an idea of far reaching effect ?

Even if the lacuna in the stanza is filled by incorporating *tya*[11] the word need not necessarily mean Kātyāyana, the famous grammarian. He was a staunch follower of Pāṇini, and one cannot expect unpaṇinian usages from him as cited below.

(1) काशीराज्ञे[12] The suffix टच् ordained by राजाहः सखिभ्यष्टच् has not been enjoined

(2) मा निर्बध्य [13] The suffix ल्यप् does not follow मा.

---

[11] The letter can be या or मा

[12] *Avimāraka,* TSS ed., p. 110.

(3) परिष्वजति[14] here the use of परस्मैपद is not strictly grammatical.

(4) परिष्वज[15] As in the previous example *Parasmaipada* is loosely used.

(5) दृष्टं चेदेकचित्तानां यग्नि[16] The simultaneous use of चेत् and यदि is not grammatically warrented.

These unpaṇinian usages render the identity of Kātyāyana, the grammarian with the author of *Avimāraka* untenable.

Authorship of Ubhayābhisārikā

Kātyāyana, the grammarian cannot be identified with Vararuci, the author of the Bhāṇa, *Ubhayābhisārikā.*[17] The very title of the play with the suffix ण्वुल् and the initial word उभय demand a great amount of grammatical exercise to make it intelligible, and yet the title yields only a strange meaning. The colloquial usages such as आनयिष्यामि[18] for आनेष्यामि, समासादिता for समासादितवती and such other case of grammatical looseness also stand against **identification. The points of similarity between** *Ubhayābhisāīrika* and the plays

---

[13] Ibid., p. 37.
[14] Ibid., p. 31.
[15] Ibid., p. 94.
[16] Ibid., p. 60.
[17] ed. T. Venkatacharya, A. K. Warder, Madras, 1987.
[18] Ibid., p. 4.

ascribed to Bhāsa consists in the method of introducing and concluding the play and suggest that the dramatic technique found in Bhāsa's plays continued to exist for some more time enabling a subsequent writer like Vararuci to follow suit.

Kata line

If the attribution of the scribe and the reading of Dr. Unni supplying त्या are taken to be true for the sake of argument the possibility is that Kātyāyana might be a family name. Pāṇini speaks of the word कत[19] as denoting the founder of a family and includes the same in लोहितादि under गर्गादिगण[20]. Hence the word कात्यायन is derived in the sense of कतस्य युवापत्यं कात्यायन meaning that कत, the founder of the line was alive at the time when his grandson flourished by the rules अपत्यं पौत्रप्रभृति गोत्रम् and जीवति तु वंश्ये युवा[21]. Thus the word कात्यायन can be a family name. कात्यायन the grammarian and वररुचि, the author of *Ubhayābhisārikā* and such other works may be assumed as the worthy descendants of that family.

Tradition and Kātyāyana

Abhijñānaśakuntalacarcā supposed to have been produced in Kerala refers to one *Avimāraka*. But it is

---

[19] सर्वत्र लोहितादि कतन्तेभ्यः Aṣṭādhyāyī, IV 1.18.

[20] गर्गादिभ्यो यण्, Ibid., IV, 1.18.

[21] Ibid., IV, 1.162 and 163.

silent about its author, and the details given there also remain inapplicable to the play published in the name of Bhāsa. In the absence of any positive evidence to speak of a tradition attributing *Avimāraka* to Kātyāyana, and advocating its prevalance in Kerala are just fanciful.

Curse upon *Avimāraka*, the hero

The adoptive father of *Avimāraka* in rage once called the sage Dīrghatapas, a *śvapaca,* dog-eating outcaste. The sage got wild and cursed him to be an outcaste along with his wife and son for a year. This need not be brought on a parallel to the state of Vararuci who was, according to a belief in Malabar treated as a *Caṇḍāla* (outcaste), for the alleged sin of marrying eighteen girls from all the eighteen castes. Even if the first part of the tradition is to be taken as true, it will not render him the state of 'Caṇḍāla since men of high castes marrying girls of the lower castes enjoyed legal sanction, and one did not become a Caṇḍāla on that count. Again the word धूर्तैः in धूर्तैर्यःश्वपचीकृतो वररुचिः[22] in the stanza in question *belies* its content that the allegation of sin

[22] The popular legend is that Vararuci married a *caṇḍāla* girl brought up by a Brahmin family not knowing her real parentage. In course of time twelve children were born to them out of which the first eleven were abandoned by the parents, and were brought up by people of different communities. The line is also read as धूर्तैर्यद् विवशीकृतो वररुचिः। Sankunni Nair, *Chatravum cāmaravum.* (Calicut, 1988), p.20.

against him has come up from a mischievous section of the society.

Avimāraka and other plays

Avimāraka does not stand apart from the rest of the plays discovered by Gaṇapati Sāstrī. The dramatic technique employed in it is the same found in the group. Though the introduction of Sūtradhāra precedes the benedictory stanza in many of the South Indian plays, Bhāsa's works including *Avimāraka* distinguish themselves on account of the complete absence of the mention of the name of the poet or the title of the work in the prologue.

As Sarup has remarked[23] a particular author takes fancy to a particular idea and cannot help repeating the same in more than one place. The poet is very much fond of the idea that one's own arms are the most appropriate weapon for the brave[24]. This is found in *Bālacarita*[25] , *Madhyamavyāyoga*[26] *Pañcarātra*[27] and *Avimāraka*[28] Nārāda is described as one interested in playing the lute

[23] *Vision*, intro. p.15.

[24] Ibid, p.15.

[25] बाहू ममैतौ प्रहरणम् । TSS ed., p.45

[26] बाहुरायुधं शरणंमम । TSS ed., p.32.

[27] सहजौ मे प्रहरणं भुजौ । TSS ed., p.88.

[28] वयमपि च भुजायुधप्रधानाः । TSS ed., p.31.

and instigating quarrels. The idea occurs in *Avimāraka*[29] and Bālacarita.[30]

The conversation that takes place between the king and the queen concerning the choice of a suitable bridegroom for their daughter is similar in *pratijñā*[31] and *Avimāraka*[32] The scenes describing the city at night in *Avimāraka*[33] and Cārudatta[34] are similar.

There are numerous similes and images in *Avimāraka* that are peculiar to Bhāsa's plays. *Saudāmini* is described in *Avimāraka* as a flash of lightning seen and lost in clouds[35]. In *Cārudatta,* Vasantasenā is described in the same way.[36] The same idea occurs in *Abhiṣeka*[37] and *Dūtavākya*[38] as well. The idea of, that which is beautiful imparts beauty to everything, is found expressed twice in *Avimāraka*[39] and once in *Pratijña*[40].

---

[29] तन्त्रीषु च स्वरगणान् कलहांश्च लोके। VI 2.

[30] तन्त्री च वैराणि च घट्टयामि , I. 4.

[31] TSS ed., p.29-30.

[32] TSS ed., p.41.

[33] Act III

[34] Acts I & III

[35] तडिदिव तोयधरेषु नष्टा।VI. 20.

[36] सौदामिनीव जलदोदरसन्निरुद्धा। I. 18.

[37] नीलजीमूतमध्यस्था विद्युल्लोखेव शोभते।II 7.

[38] नवसलिलद्पार्श्वे चारुविद्युल्लतेव।V. 47.

[39] सर्वमलकारो भवति सुरूपाणाम्।II.

आकृतिरेव भर्तृदारिकाया अलङ्कार इति भणामि। Act II.

[40] सर्वशोभनीयं सुरूपं नाम। Act. I.

Common vocabulary and expression are present in *Avimāraka* also. एकातपत्र used in *Dūtavākya*[41], *Pratijñā*[42] - and *Svapnavasavadatta*[43] occurs in the very first stanza of *Avimāraka*. The word अच्छल used many times in *Avimāraka*[44] is found repeated in *Pañcarātra*.[45] The other expressions are दूतसम्पात, (*Avimāraka*[46] and *Svapnavāsavadatta)*[47], सुमनोवर्णकेन (*Avimāraka*[48] and *Svapnavāsavadatta*[49]), अलं भवानतिमात्रं सन्तप्य (*Avimāraka*[50], *Svapnavāsavadatta*[51]) and *Cārudatta*.[52] सङ्घ चारिणोऽनर्थाः occurs in *Avimāraka*[53] and *Pratijñā*[54] आवासमेव गच्छामि is employed in *Avimarāka*[55] and *Carudatta*[56]

---

41 P.56
42 Act VII 1
43 Act VI 19
44 अच्छलं मित्रत्वं नाम। p.64. also अच्छलं हि स्नेहो नाम p. 83. Also जानामि भवतोऽच्छलां बुद्धिम्। p. 67.
45 अच्छलो धर्मः p. 16.
46 Avimāraka, TSS ed. p.12
47 TSS ed. p.17.
48 TSS ed. p.54.
49 TSS ed. p.70.
50 TSS p. 83.
51 TSS p.123.
52 TSS p.12.
53 TSS p.14.
54 TSS p.52.
55 TSS p.14.
56 TSS p.10.

The metres सुवदना and दण्डक not preferred by classical dramatists are found in *Avimāraka*[57] *Pañcarātra*[58] *Dūtavākya*[59] and *Pratijñā.*[60] Instances of split up verses of the same speaker occur in *Avimāraka*[61] and *Pratijña.*[62] Portions of verses used in the conversation of two characters are found in *Avimāraka*[63] as well as *Bālacarita*[64] and *Pañcarātra.*[65]

The treatment of rasa in *Avimāraka* is the same found in the rest of the plays. Santuṣṭa in *Avimāraka,* and śakāra in *Cārudatta* supply humour to the numerous situations in which they figure. The fondness of Bhāsa for *Karuṇarasa* gets strong expression in the wailings of Dhṛtarāṣtra, Gāndhārī, Dussala, Devakī, Daśaratha, Duryodhana and others. The pathetic condition of *Avimāraka* and Kuraṅgī in seperation is described in the most touching manner possible. It stands parallel to the description of the state of Vāsavadatta in *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Sīta in Abhiṣeka.* The sentiment of terror delineated in *Madhyamavyāyoga* when the Brahmin family is confronted by the demon, and in the *Bālacarita* in the killing of Kamsa pulling him by the hair resembles

---

[57] Act V.6.
[58] I.6.
[59] TSS p.15.
[60] III 2,7.
[61] II 14,VI.6.c
[62] I. 2.
[63] VI. 12.
[64] V. 10.
[65] II. 37, 39.

the same in the various trials *Avimāraka* faces before he goes to the harem, (Kanyāpura).

Bhāsa never brings needless characters on the stage. This is true of *Avimāraka* as well. He keeps away Kāśīraja and Sucetanā in the play as he does with Udayana and Vāsavadattā in *Pratijñā.*

The pithy proverbial sayings in *Avimāraka* correspond well with the other dramas of the group either in phraseology or in their style.

1. कन्यापितुर्हि सततं बहु चिन्तनीयम्।[66]

2. विवाहा नाम बहुशः परीक्ष्य कर्तव्या भवन्ति।[67]

3. कस्तावदौषधमुपलभ्य मन्दीभवत्यातुरः।[68]

4. सर्वमलङ्कारो भवति सुरूपाणाम्।[69]

5. आकृतिरेव भर्तृदारिकाया अलङ्कारा इति भणामि।[70]

6. न तथा रत्नमासाद्य सुजनः परितुष्यति
   यथा तत्तद्गताकाङ्क्षे पात्रे दत्वा प्रहृष्यति।[71]

7. अच्छलो हि स्नेहो नाम।[72]

---

[66] TSS, p.3.
[67] TSS, p.3.
[68] TSS, p.26.
[69] TSS, p.28.
[70] TSS, p.55.
[71] TSS, p.65.
[72] TSS, p.83.

8. प्राज्ञस्य मूर्खस्य च कर्मयोगे
समत्वमभ्येति तनुर्न बुद्धिः।[73]

Conclusion

The presence of *Svapnavāsavadatta* in the palace Library of manuscripts was first noted by Āyilyam Tirunal. Gaṇapatisāstri could discover the play independently as included in a bundle of dramas sharing common characteristics at a subsequent date.

Avimāraka is attributed by Gaṇapati Śāstri along with twelve other *Rūpakas* on the basis of internal and external evidences. The ascription is hailed by many while it is questioned in full or in parts by a few. Dr. Unni takes *Avimāraka* to have been composed by Kātyāyana-Vararuci on the basis of internal and external evidences. The ascription is hailed by many while it is questioned in full or in parts by a few. Dr. Unni takes *Avimāraka* to have been composed by Kātyāyana-Vararuci on the strength of the reading of a stanza authored by a scribe, inserting a letter to get the name of Kātyāyana. An examination of the same reveals that the stanza cannot come from a competent pen, and that Katyayana, the grammarian cannot be the author of *Avimāraka*. Numerous unpaṇinian usages render the identification impossible. The authorship of *Ubhayābhisārikā* goes to Vararuci who in all possibility followed

---

[73] TSS, p.83.

the practice maintained by Bhāsa. *Abhijñāna-śākuntalacarcā* work supposed to have been produced in Kerala refers to *Avimāraka;* but does not mention the name of its author and the details therein remain inapplicable to the drama published in the name of Bhāsa. There is no positive evidence of a tradition which attributes *Avimāraka* to Vararuci either in Kerala or anywhere else. Vararuci did not downgrade himself as a *Caṇḍāla* by his conduct. The hero of the play, *Avimāraka* becomes a Caṇḍāla on account of his adoptive father loosing his temper so as to arouse the *ire* of a sage, and the state of his deterioration in social status is only for one year. Hence there is no room for finding an autobiographical element in the drama centering round the temporal degraded state of the hero. *Avimāraka* and other plays exhibit a family likeness and form a group by themselves. Taking all the above-mentioned facts into consideration it can be categorically stated that the position of Gaṇapati Śastri regarding the authorship of *Avimāraka* stands unassailed.

TRIVANDRUM SANSKRIT SERIES - CENTENARY ADDRESS

Dr. T. Devarajan

The Trivandrum Sanskrit Series has completed a century since its inception and the first publication of a Sanskrit manuscript from Trivandrum. The TSS which may have emulated its name from Kashmir Sanskrit Series has made substantial contribution to the field of Indology. TSS, the three letter abbreviation which stands for Trivandrum Sanskrit Series carries with it the name of a treasure house of knowledge in Mss, the repository of a great heritage and culture, the beacon of light emerging from the confluence of different sources of knowledge which the scholars across our country and the great savants the world over appreciated with awe and respect. The TSS of the present day is the outcome of the diligence and devoted activities of the royal patrons and a great row of profound and illustrious scholars. The institution behind the TSS, the generous persons who patronised it and the preceptors who toiled to sustain its continuity in publication have attained fame and respect from the indologists and scholars' community. In short TSS has become the synonym of a prestigious institution under the University of Kerala, viz., the Oriental

Research Institute and Manuscripts Library (ORI & Mss Library) and its Sanskrit publications. This Department and its publications in Sanskrit and Malayalam under the TSS and Malayalam Granthavali have got a great history behind them.

Royal patronage

The kings of Travancore were great warriors benevolent rulers, generous patrons of literature and themselves scholars and poets. They have made remarkable contributions to literature, drama, and dramaturgy, music, grammar and other performing arts.

Martanda Varman (1729-58,847-1860) the founder of modern Travancore was a great scholar, shrewd king in warfare and administration. Being a generous patron of literature there flourished in his court several poets and scholars. Rāmapāṇivāda, Rāmapurattu Vāriyar, Devaraja of Āśrāmam, Uṇṇāyi Vāriyar and so on were some of the prominent poets of his court.

Kārtika Tirunāl Rāmavarman (1758-98), renowned as the Dharmarāja and the rephew of Martandavarman was a versatile scholar in Persian, Hindustani, Portuguese, English, Sanskrit and Malayalam. His Bālarāmabharata is an independent work on dancing. He has also contributed five works to the art of Kathakaḷi. Sadāśivadīkṣita, Kalyāṇasubrahmaṇaya, Pandalam

subrahmanya Sastri, Iṭaveṭṭikkāṭṭu Nārayaṇan Nampūtiri were famous poets who sought the patronage of Kārtika Tirunāl.

Aśvati Tirunāl Yuvarāja (1785-95), another prince of the Travancore Royal Family has contributed Rukmiṇīsvayamvara, a drama in V Acts; Sṛṅgāra Sudhākara, a bhāṇa type of drama, Vañcīmahārājastava, a panegyric on his uncle Kārtika Tirunāl, Santānagopāla and Kārtavīryavijaya two Campūs; and Daśāvatāra daṇḍaka a narration on the incarnations of Viṣṇu in Sanskrit. He was also the author of four Kathakali works.

Svāti Tirunāl, the Monarch Musician famous as Garbhaśrīmān (1829-47) was a well known linguist conversant in Malayalam, Sanskrit, English, Tamil, Telugu, Kannada and Hindustani. Bhaktimañjari, Padmanābhaśataka, Syānandūrapuravarṇanaprabandha, Ajamiḷopākhyāna, Kucelopākhyāna are his Sanskrit works. His musical compositions made him famous as the musician among Monarchs and the Monarch among musicians. His musical compositions are in Sanskrit, Malaylam, Kannada, Telugu, Maratti and Hindustani. Merusvāmi and Vaṭivelu, two musicians and the Malayalam poets like Kilimānūr Vidvān Koil Tampuran and Irayimman Tampi were famous proteges of his court.

Āyilyam Tirunāl (1860-80) Viśakham Tirunal (1880-85), Sri Mūlam Tirunal (1885-56) and Sri Cittira Tirunal (1931-1991) have made remarkable contributions

to the different field of Sanskrit learning. King Ayilyam Tirunal, proficient in art, music and various sciences took interest to collect all available Mss. from the State of Travancore and preserve them in the library attached to the palace. The Mss. collected on his directions included the bundles from Maṇalikkara Nampūtiri family which led to the discovery and publication of the dramas of Bhasa by T. Ganapatisastrikal.

The history of the Mss. Library

Śrī Mūlam Tirunāl, the king of Travancore and a true aesthete of art and literature was mainly responsible for the spread of Oriental literature, particularly Sanskrit through out Keala state and outside. His curiosity to learn and the interest to publish Mss. led to the setting up of a separate Department for the publication of Sanskrit Mss. of the palace Library and some other private collections. Śrī Mūlam Tirunāḷ entrusted the task of publishing Sanskrit Mss. with T. Ganapati Sastrikal, a noted scholar and the then Principal of the Govt. Sanskrit College, Trivandrum. A new Department started functioning in the Lakṣmīvilāsam Bungalow at Killippalam with Ganapati Sastri at its head. The Mss. Library and office began functioning at the Lakṣmivilāsam Bungalow, Killippalam and the printing in Devanagari script was conducted in the Government Press of erstwhile Travancore. Śrī. Mūlam Tirunāl, the ruling King was pleased on seeing the Sanskrit books edited and printed in Devanagari script for the first time in Kerala.

The Mss. Library was shifted to Shanmukhavilasam Bungalow at Thaikkadu and from there to Koḷikulaṅgara building near the training college, Trivandrum (in 1936) and from there to a Government building at Kowdiar for ensuring sufficient space and security. The library was later attached to the University of Travancore in 1940 and shifted to the Arts College building at Thaikkadu. Due to the increase in the number of Mss., the library was then housed in a new building at Sanskrit College, Trivandrum. It was later shifted to the Oriental Language Block at the University Campus, Kariavattom as part of centralising University's teaching Departments there.

It was during the tenure of Dr.K. Raghavan Pillai as the Director that Dr. Karan Singh, the central Minister happened to visit the library at Kariavattom. Dr. Singh, a profound scholar in Sanskrit and a member of the royal family of Kashmir being a genuine enthusiast of manuscript studies was really shocked and displeased to see the valuable Mss. scattered and dumped at the different corners of the stock room without deciphering and preserving them properly. Dr. Singh took personal interest and offered the whole expense as Govt. aid for a new building in the traditional architectural style with provision for an air conditioned stock room to preserve as many as manuscripts as possible and with other proper amenities. Though the University took almost a Plan period to submit the plan and estimate, the proposal was

sanctioned with immediate effect even though Dr. Singh was not in office by the time. The Construction Corporation, a Department under the Government of Kerala took another Plan period for completing the present structure of the Mss. library. The Mss. library was shifted to the present new building in 1982 from the Oriental Block under the direct supervision and Headship of Dr. T. Bhaskaran (1982 - 1990). He was succeeded by Dr. K. Vijayan (1990-1997) as the Professor & Director. Presently Dr. P. Visalakshy is heading the library since 1997.

Originally there was only one Department for the collection, preservation and publication of Sanskrit and Malayalam Manuscripts. This caused much delay in the activities of the library, particularly in the publication of ancient Mss. So separate Departments were instituted in 1924 for the publication of Sanskrit and Malayalam Mss. The Mss. of Ayurveda were entrusted with the Director of Ayurveda. An advisory Board constituted for publication expressed its dissatisfaction in the slow progress of the publication of Sanskrit, Malayalam and Ayurvedic Manuscripts. Following the recommendation of the Board, the Departments for the Publication of Sanskrit, Malayalam and Ayurvedic Manuscripts were unified under the control of a Curator in 1930 and the Department was designated as the Department for the publication of Oriental Manuscripts

The Research Institute and Courses

In 1940 the King and Chancellor of the Travancore University unified the publication Department and the Mss. library to form the University Oriental Manuscripts Library. Sir C.P.Ramaswamy Iyer, the then Diwan took interest to convert the Oriental Mss. Library into an Advanced Centre for Indological Studies. In 1966, the institution was declared as the Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library. Ph.D course in Sanskrit was first started in 1977 under the guidance of Dr.K.Raghavan Pillai, the then Curator whose designation was modified as Director of the Institute. Dr.T.Bhaskaran took charge of the Institute in 1982 as the Director and Professor of Malayalam due to the retirement of Dr.K.Raghavan Pillai. Research for Ph.D in Malayalam was begun under Dr. T. Bhaskaran and Dr. K. Appukuttan Nair. Ph.D couse in Tamil was started in the Institute under the guidance of the late Dr.P. Padmanabhan Thampi (1985-98) when he joined the Institute as Lecturer in Tamil. But it took some more time to begin the M.Phil Course in Manuscriptology under the headship of Dr.K.Vijayan in 1996.

Publications: 1903 is considered as the year of inception of the edition and publication of Sanskrit Mss. *Bhaktimañjarī* and *Syānandūrapuravarṇanaprabandha* by Ramavarma Svati Tirunal were the first two publications that came out in 1904 from Govt. Press, Trivandrum. They were not numbered in the TSS. This period of

inception has not been counted by some for calculating the centenary of the Institute and the TSS. The first Sanskrit book numbered under the Trivandrum Sanskrit Series was published in 1905. If 1905, the year in which the first Sanskrit work was published, is taken for calculating the Centenary of the TSS, then the TSS completes its 100 years in 2004.

Publication of Malayalam Mss. was started in 1924 under a new series called Śrimūlam Malayāḷa Bhāṣā Granthāvalī (25 works). The scientific works among the Maḷayalam publications were known after the name of the Regent as Sri Vañci Setulakṣmī Granthāvalī (total 19 works). The Sanskrit publications during the Regency period were called Setulakṣmī Prasādamālā. Both Sankrit and Malayalam Mss. were published under the sub-title Śri Citrodayamañjarī series (Mal. 19) from the date on which Śri. Citra Tirunāḷ Bālarāmavarma came to the throne. However, the Sanskrit publications of the Institute were also carrying their original title the TSS.

The Scholars behind the TSS. More than two hundred scholars under the supervision of a dozen Curators or Directors have devoted their lives for the sustenance of the TSS. A total of 267 works have been published under this series till date beginning from *Daiva* of Deva to Rāmābhyudaya (TSS. 267). The full credit of the TSS, goes to T.Ganapati Sastri, the founder of the series. He had served the library for a period of 22 years from 1903 to 1925 and have published 87 books under

the TSS. His publications include a variety of subjects like Vedanta, *Kāvya, Nataka, Vyakaraṇa, Tantra, Mīmāmsa, Śilpa, Arthaśāstra* and devotional songs. His scholarly introductions to these works opened a new vista in research. His qualities of a profound scholar, critic, commentator and poet are expressed in his publications. But it was the discovery, edition and publication of the 13 plays ascribed to the authorship of Bhasa that made him famous all over the world. His tiresome work found fruition when he was awarded the title Mahāmahopādhyāya by the British Government and the honorary Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by the Tubingen University, Germany posthumously.

K. Sambasiva Sastri succeeded Ganapati Sastri as the Curator of the Mss. Library from 1926 to 1939. He was a noted scholar in Vyakarana and a fluent speaker in Sanskrit. The fervent activities in the publication of Mss. initiated by Ganapati Sastri was sustained by Sambasiva Sastri and he has published 55 Mss. under the TSS from nos. 88 to 143.

Ullur S. Parameswara Iyer was in office as the Curator for a short period and published nine Malayalam works. *Kolatteri Śaṅkara Menon* who succeeded Ulloor as the Curator has to his credit twenty works published from Mss.

Dr. L.A. Ravivarma (1941-1942) the next Curator of the library published five works under the TSS.

from nos. 144 to 148. The works of Descriptive Catalogue began by Sambasiva Sastri was completed and published by Ravivarma.

V.A. Ramaswami Sastri, the next Curator who served for six years from 1942 to 1948 started the preparation of Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts. Small works in Sanskrit were published from Mss. in a new quarterly started by him. The *Taddhita* part of *Prakriyā Sarvasva*, a portion of the Malayalam commentary on *Arthaśāstra*, the first part of *Tantrasamuccaya* with two commentaries etc. were his publicatons. TSS nos.149 to 154 were published by Ramaswami.

Dr. P. K. Narayana Pillai, an eminent scholar who succeeded Ramaswami as Curator assumed charge of the Institute in 1948 and continued in the office till 1953. *Vāsudevastava* and his edition of *Madhyama-vyāyoga, Laghubhāskarīya, Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, Viṣṇuvilāsa, Madanaketucarita, Aitareya Brahmaṇa* and *Śeṣasa-muccaya* were some of his important publications under the TSS from 155 to 168. Malayalam publications include *Padyaratna, Uṇṇiyaccīcarita, Cellūranāthodaya, Prācīna-gadyamātṛkakal* and so on. Dr. P. K. took interest to arrange a portrait of Dr. T Ganapatisastrikal and the same was got unveiled by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan in 1939.

K.S. Mahadevasastri (1953) the successor of Dr.P.K took much interest in the publication of Malayalam works. *Tantrasamuccaya,* Part II and *Mālatīmādhava* were his two works appeared in the TSS from 169 to 170.

Dr. Sūranādu Kuñjan Pillai (1954-60), the versatile scholar was the Honorary Director of the library for five years. He took interest to collect a large number of Mss. and enrich the library.Twenty Malayalam and 19 Sanskrit works (TSS 171 to 189) were published by him. *Horāśāstra, Avantisundarīkathā, Prakriyāsarvasva* Part IV (1954) *Nṛgamokṣam campū,* and *Śivavilāsa kāvya* were his contribtions to TSS. His introductions to the works are highly informative. He took interest to add index of various types to his editions.

Dr. K. Raghavan Pillai (1960-81), the successor of Suranadu Kunjan Pillai served the library for 22 years. During his tenure he published 61 Sanskrit (TSS 191 to 251) and 43 Malayalam works. *Bālarāmavijayacampū, Abhijñāna Śākuntalacarcā, Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya, Sandeśa catuṣṭaya, Pūrvabhāratacampū, Aitareyāraṇyaka, Śrīcihnakāvya, Kṛṣṇīya* and *Mūṣikavamśa* are his prominent contributions to TSS.

Dr. T. Bhaskaran, the successor of Dr. Raghavan Pillai published five works under the Sanskrit Series, viz., *Bahuvṛttasamkṣepabhārata, Viśākhatulābhāra prabandha, Advaitaśataka, Prakriyāsarvasva* Part. V and *Bhāsanāṭaka cakra.* The last mentioned is a collection of the 13 plays

of Bhasa published in Malayalam character under Malayalam Granthavali No. 162 in 1987, the Platinum Jubilee year of the Library.

Dr . Bhaskaran has also 21 books in Malayalam, 2 books in Tamil, three Volumes of the Sanskrit Alphabetical Index, two Volumes of Malayalam Alphabetical Index and Alphabetical Index of Tamil Manuscripts.

Dr. K. Vijayan, the successor of Dr. T. Bhaskaran served the library as the Director & Professor from 1990 to 1997 and published Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Mss. Vol.VI and the *Chandaśakhaṇḍa* of *Prakriyāsarvasva* Vol.VII. The *Citrarāmāyaṇa, Rāmāyaṇa* in palm leaf pictures, with critical notes under TSS. No. 265 is a noteworthy work that attracted the attention of the scholars in and outside India.

The Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Mss. Vol.VII and *Rāmābhyudaya* are the last two additions to the TSS by Dr. P. Visalakshy, the present Reader- in -Charge of the Library.

Sorry to say that a large number of important works needed by scholars remain unpublished. Most of the Mss. have become perished and useless by the passage of time. Some of the Mss. have been copied to microfilm as part of a project sponsored by the Indira

Gandhi National Centre for the Arts, New Delhi. The Manuscripts Mission, another project sponsored by the Ministry of Cultural Affairs, Govt. of India is now digitizing the Mss. We can expect a better future for the Mss. the contents of which will be protected by digitization to posterity.

Reprints of TSS

A large number of works brought to light from Mss., by T. Ganapati Śastri and his subordinates were photocopied and published as reprints by private publishing companies from Delhi appended with an elaborate introduction in the editorship of a new scholar. He raises the lame excuse that the publishers have reprinted these books owned by the University of Kerala since the issue of the copyright does not arise for these volumes and that such books have gone out of print and the world of scholars was at a disadvantage in using these Volumes. But he keeps silence on the huge amount the publishers have earned from these reprints at the expense of the Government or University and the diligence of a number of eminent scholars who have toiled to edit and publish them first from several Mss.

The TSS has made substantial contribution to the field of Indology, particularly to the publication of Sanskrit works from Kerala. Every branch of Sanskrit

learning from Kerala is being welcomed by scholars as it has its own peculiarities. At the time of this Centenary Address, I extend my obeysance with all respect to the Great Masters who have toiled for the TSS. and again offer **Floral Tribute** to the lotus feet of Dr. T. Ganapati Śastrikal the Master mind behind the TSS.

A list of the TSS publications in serial order will be useful for the scholars who search for it as a complete list is not available anywhere with the year of publication.

1. *Daivam* by Deva relates to grammatical roots with the *Puruṣākāra* commentary of Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka, 1905.
2. Abhinavakaustubhamālā and Dakṣiṇāmūrtistava, two stotras by Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka, 1905.
3. *Nalābhyudaya* by Vāmanabhaṭṭa Bāṇa, 2nd Edn. 1907. A kavya.
4. *Śivalīlārṇava*, a kavya by Nīlakaṇṭhadīkṣita, 1909.
5. *Vyaktiviveka* of Mahimabhatta with commentary, refuting the Dhvani theory of Anandavardhana, 1909.
6. *Durghaṭavṛtti* (Vyakarana) by Śaraṇadeva, 1909.
7. *Brahmatattvaprakāśikā* (Vedanta) by Sadāśivendra-sarasvati, 1909.
8. *Pradyumnābhyudaya* by Ravivarmakulaśekhara, 1910. The author (1266) was a king of Kollam who became the emperor of Kerala and the

overlord of the Pāṇḍyas and Colas. *Pradyumnābhyudaya* is a Nāṭaka in five acts describing how Pradyumma killed Vajranābha and married his daughter Prabhāvatī.

9. *Virūpākṣa Pañcāśikā* (Vedanta) by Virūpākṣanātha with the commentary of Vidyacakravartin, 1910.

10. *Mātaṅgalīla* by Nilakaṇṭha of Tirumaṅgala, 1910. On elephant lore.

11. *Tapatīsamvaraṇa* by Kulaśekharavarma of Mahodayapura with the commentary of Sivarama, 1911. A Nātaka in six acts deals with the love of Tapatī, the daughter of Sun god and Samvaraṇa, a king of Hastinapura.

12. *Paramārthasāra* (Vedanta) by Ādiśeṣa with the commentary of Rāghavānanda, 1911.

13. *Subhadrādhanañjayam* by Kulaśekharavarma of Mahodayapura with the commentary of Sivarāma, 1912. A Nataka in five acts describes Arjuna's marriage with Subhadra.

14. Nītisāra (Nīti) by Kāmandaka with the commentary of Śaṅkarācārya, 1912.

15. *Svapnavāsavadatta* (Nāṭaka) by Bhasa in VI acts (2nd edn.)., 1912.

16. *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* (Nāṭaka) by Bhasa in 4 acts, 1912.

17. *Pañcarātra* (Nāṭaka) by Bhasa, 1917.

18. *Nārāyaṇīya*, a Stotra in praise of the lord of Guruvāyūr, in one hundred Daśakas by Narayana Bhatta of Melpattur with the commentary from Deśamaṅgalavārya, 1912.
19. *Mānameyodaya* (Mimāmsa), Māna part by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa and Meya part by Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, 1912.
20. *Avimārāka*, a Nāṭaka by Bhasa, in 6 acts, 1912.
21. *Bālacarita* (Nāṭaka) by Bhasa, in 5 acts, 1912.
22. *Madhyamavyāyoga, Dūtavākya, Dūtaghaṭotkaca, Karṇabhāra* and *Ūrubhaṅaga* (five dramas) by Bhasa, 1912.
23. *Nānārthārṇavasamkṣepa* (Kośa) by Keśavasvāmin (Part I, 1st and 2nd Kāṇḍas) 1913.
24. *Jānakīpariṇaya* (Kāvya) by Cakra kavi, 1913.
25. *Kāṇādasiddhānta candrikā* (Nyāya) by Gaṅgādharasūri, 1913.
26. *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* by Bhasa in 6 acts, 1913.
27. *Kumārasambhava* by Kalidasa with the two commentaries, Prakāśikā of Aruṇagirinātha and Vivaraṇa of Nārāyṇa Paṇḍita (Part I, Ist and 2nd Sargas), 1913.
30. *Vāstuvidyā* (Śilpa) anonymous, 1913.
31. *Nānārthārṇavasamkṣepa* (Kośa) by Kesavasvamin (Part III, 4th to 6th Kaṇḍas), 1913.

32. Kumārasambhava (Kavya) by Kalidasa with the two commentaries, *Prakāśikā* of Aruṇagirinātha and *Vivaraṇa* of Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita (Part II, 3rd to 5th Sargas), 1913.

33. *Vārarucasaṅgraha* (Vyakarana) with the commentary *Dīpaprabhā* of Narayanan Namputiri of Akkittam, 1913.

34. *Maṇidarpaṇa* (Nyaya) by Rājacūḍāmaṇi Makhin, 1913.

35. *Maṇisāra* (Nyaya) by Gopinatha, 1914.

36. *Kumārasambhava* (Kavya) by Kalidasa, with the two commentaries, Prakāsikā of Aruṇagirinatha and *Vivaraṇa* of Narayana Pandita (Part III, 6th to 8th Sargas), 1914.

37. *Āśaucāṣṭaka* (Smṛti) by Vararuci with commentary, 1914.

38. *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* (Kośa) by Amarasimha with the commentary Ṭīkāsarvasva of Vandyaghaṭiya Sarvānanda (Part I), 1st Kanda, 1914.

40. Alaṅkārasūtra by Rājānaka Ruyyaka with the Alaṅkarasarvasva of Maṅkhuka and its commentary by Samudrabandha, 1915.

41. Adhyātmapaṭalam (Vedanta) by Āpastamba with the Vivaraṇa of Sri-Sankara Bhagavat Pāda, 1915.

42. Pratimānāṭaka by Bhasa in 7 acts 1915.

43. *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* (Kośa) by Amarasimha with the two commentaries *Amarakośodghāṭana* of Kṣīrasvāmin and *Ṭikāsarvasva* of Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda (Part II, 2nd Kāṇḍa, 1-6 Vargas) 1915.

44. *Tantraśuddha* by Bhaṭṭāraka Vedottama, 1915.

45. *Prapañcahṛdaya*, Anon., 1915. Deals with the different arts and sciences.

46. *Paribhāṣāvṛtti* (Vyākaraṇa) by Nilakaṇṭha Dikṣita, 1915.

47. *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana* (Vedanta) by Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvati (Part I), 1916.

48. "Do" (Part II), 1916.

49. *Goḷadīpikā* (Jyotiṣa) by Paramesvaran Namputiri of Vaṭaśśeri on spherical geometry, 1916.

50. *Rasārṇavasudhākara* (Alankara) by Siṅga Bhūpala, 1916.

51. Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana (Kośa) by Amarasimha with two commentaries, *Amarakośodghāṭana* of Kṣīrasvāmin and *Ṭikāsarvasva* of Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda (Part III, 2nd Kāṇḍa, 7 to 10 Vargas), 1917.

52. *Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana* (Kośa) by Amarasimha with the commentary *Ṭikāsarvasva* of Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānanda (Part IV, 3rd Kāṇḍa), 1917.

53. *Śabdanirṇaya* (Vedanta) by Prakāśātma yatīndra, 1917.

54. *Spoṭasiddhinyāyavicāra* (Vyakarana), 1917.

55. Mattavilāsaprahasana, a Prahasana type of drama by Mahendravikramavarman, 1917.

56. *Manuṣyālayacandrikā* (Śilpa). A practical text book on Indian architecture in seven Adhyāyas summarizing the basic principles, theories and philosophy of *Vāstu* particularly of human dwelling places.The influence of *Tantrasamuccaya* is evident.

57. Raghuvīracarita (Kāvya), 1917.

58. *Siddhāntasiddhāñjana* (Vedanta) by Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvati (Part III), 1917.

59. *Nāgānanda* (Nāṭaka) by Sri Harṣadeva with the commentary *Vimarśinī* of Śivarāma, 1917.

60. *Laghustuti* by Laghubhaṭṭāraka with the commentary of Rāghavānanda, 1917.

61. Siddhāntasiddhāñjana (Vedanta) by Kṛṣṇānanda Sarasvati (Part IV), 1918.

62. Sarvamatasaṅgraha, 1918.

63. Kirātārjuniya (Kavya) by Bhāravi with the commentary Śabdārthadīpikā of Citrabhānu. (1 to 3 Sargas), 1918.

64. *Meghasandeśa* by Kalidasa with the *Pradīpa* commentary of Dakṣiṇāvartanātha, 1919.

65. *Mayamata* (Silpa) by Mayamuni; 1919.

66. *Mahārthamañjarī* (Darśana) with the commentary *Parimala* of Mahesvarānanda, 1919.

67. *Tantrasamuccaya* (Tantra) by Narayanan Nampūtiri of Cennas with the commentary *Vimarśini* of Sankara (Part I, 1-6 Paṭalas), 1919. The work is a digest in 12 *Paṭalas* dealing with the consecration and worship of the major Hindu deities. Sankaran Namputiri was the son of Cennas Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri.

68. *Tattvaprakāśa* (Āgama) by Sri Bhojadeva with the commentary *Tātparyadīpikā* of Śrī Kumāra, 1920.

69. *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (Tantra) by Īśānaśivagurudevamiśra (Part I, Sāmānyapāda) 1920. A detailed work on Kerala Tantra comprising all the four parts of the subject.

70. *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Par I), 1920.

71. Tantrasamuccaya (Tantra) by Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri with the commentary *Vimarśinī* of Sankaran Namputiri (Part II, 7-12 Paṭalas), 1921.

72. *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (Tantra) by Īśānaśiva-gurudevamiśra (Part II, Mantrapada), 1921.

73. *Iśvarapratipattiprakāśa* (Vedanta) by Madhusūdana Sarasvati, 1921.

74. *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* with the commentary *Bālakrīḍā* of Viśvarūpācārya (Part I, Ācāra and Vyavahāra Adhyāyas) 1922.

75. *Śilparatna* (Śilpa) by Śrikumāra (Part I, 46 Chapters), 1922. The work is a comprehensive treatise on Architecture, iconography, religious, domestic, and allied subjects in 81 chapters.

76. *Āryamañjuśrimūlakalpa* (Part II), 1923.

77. *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (Tantra) by Iśānasivagurudevamiśra (Part III, Kriyāpada, 1-3 Patalas), 1923.

78. Āśvalāyanagṛhyasūtra, with the commentary Anāvila of Haradattācārya, 1923.

79. *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya with commentary by T. Ganapati Śastri (Part I, 1 and 2 Adhikaraṇas) 1924.

80. *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya with commentary by T. Ganapati Sastri (Part II, 3-7 Adhikaraṇas) 1924.

81. *Yājñavalkyasmṛti* with the Bālakrīḍā commentary of Viśvarūpācārya (Part II, Prāyaścittādhyāya) 1924.

82. *Arthaśāstra* of Kauṭalya with commentary by T. Ganapati Śastri (Part III, 8-15 Adhikaraṇas) 1925.

83. *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati* (Tantra) by Iśānaśivagurudevamiśra (Part IV, Kriyāpāda 31-64 Paṭalas and Yogapāda), 1925.

84. *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa* (Part III), 1925.

85. *Viṣṇusamhita* (Tantra) by Sumati, 1925.

86. Bharatacarita (Kavya) by Kṛṣnakavi, 1925.

87. Saṅgītasamayasāra (Saṅgīta) Saṅgītakāra Pārśvadeva, 1925.

K.Sambasiva Sastri who succeeded Ganapati Sastri as the curator of the Mss. Library has edited some 55 works in the TSS from 88 to 142.

88. *Kāvyaprakāśa* by Mammatabhatta with two commentaries, the *Sampradāyaprakāśinī* of Sri. Vidyācakravartin and the *Sāhityacūḍāmaṇī* of Bhaṭṭagopāla (Part I, 1-5 Ullasas), 1926.

89. *Sphoṭasiddhi* (Vyākaraṇa) by Bharatamisra, 1927.

90. *Mīmāmsāślokavārtikā* by Parameśvara of Payyūr with the commentary *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamiśra, 1926.

91. *Horāśāstra* of Varāhamihirācārya with the *Vivaraṇa* commentary of Rudra, 1926.

92. *Rasopaniṣat*, 1926.

93. *Vedāntaparibhāṣā* (Vedanta) of Dharmarājādhvarīndra with the *Prakāśikā* commentary of Peddādikṣita, 1928.

94. *Bṛhaddeśī* (Saṅgita) Mātaṅgamuni, 1928.

95. *Raṇadīpikā* (Jyotiṣa) of Kumāragaṇaka, 1928. A work on warfare in 8 Chapters wrote at the instance of one Devaśarma.

96. *Ṛksamhita* with the Bhāṣya of Skandasvāmin and the commentary of *Veṅkaṭamādhavārya* (Part I, 1st Adhyāya in 1st Aṣṭaka), 1929.

97. *Nāradīyamanusamhita* (Smṛti) with Bhāṣya of Bhavasvāmin, 1929.

98. *Śilparatna* (Śilpa) by Śrīkumāra (Part II, Chapters 47-81), 1929.

99. *Mīmāmsāślokavārtikā* (Mīmāmsā) with the commentary *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamiśra (Part II), 1929.

100. *Kāvyaprakāśa* of Mammatabhatta with the two commentaries - *Sampradāyaprakāśinī* of Śrividyācakravartin and *Sahityacūḍāmaṇī* of Bhaṭṭagopāla (Part II, 6 - 10 Ullasas), 1930.

101. *Āryabhaṭīya* (Jyotiṣa) of Āryabhaṭācārya with the Bhāṣya of Nīlakaṇṭhasomasutvan (Part I, Gaṇitapāda), 1930.

102. *Dattila* (Saṅgīta), Dattilamuni, 1930.

103. *Hamsasandeśa* (Vedanta) with the commentary, 1930.

104. *Sāmbapañcāśikā* (stotra) with the commentary, 1930.

105. *Nidhipradīpa* of Siddhaśrīkaṇthaśambhu, 1930.

106. *Prakriyāsarvasva* (Vyakarana) of Sri Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa with the commentary (Part I) 1930. A grammatical work in 20 sections incorporating the observations of Non-Pāṇinīyan writers also.

107. *Kāvyaratna* (Kāvya) of Arhaddāsa, 1930.

108. *Bālamārtāṇḍavijaya* of Devarajasūri 1930. A drama in five acts deals with the exploits of Martāṇḍavarma of Travancore and the dedication of his Kingdom to Lord Padmanabha of Trivandrum.

109. *Nyāyasāra* with the commentary of Vāsudevasūri, 1931.

110. Āryabhaṭiya (Jyotiṣa) of Āryabhaṭācārya with the Bhāṣya of Nīlakaṇṭhasomasutvan (Part II, Kālakriyāpāda), 1931.

111. *Hṛdayapriyā* (Vaidyaka) by Paramesvara, 1931. The work in 4 Khaṇḍas deals with all aspects of Ayurveda.

112. *Kucelopākhyāna* and *Ajamilopākhyāna* (Saṅgita) by H.H. Svāti Sri Rama Varma Mahārāja, 1932. Two small musical works written in the *Harikathākālakṣepa* style of song and verse; based on Bhagavata.

113. *Saṅgītakṛtis* (Gāna) by H.H. Svati Sri Rama Varma Mahāraja, 1932.

114. *Sāhityamīmāmsa* (Alankara), 1934.

115. *Ṛksamhita* with the Bhāṣya of Skandasvāmin and the commentary of Veṅkaṭamādhavārya, Part II, 2nd Adhyāya in 1st Aṣṭaka,1935.

116. Vākyapadīya (Vyakarana) with the commentary Prakīrṇakaprakāśa by Helarāja son of Bhūtirāja (Part I), 1935.

117. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* by Bhojadeva with the commentary of Sri Nārāyaṇa Daṇḍanātha (Part I), 1935.

118. *Bālarāmabharatam* (Nāṭya) by Balarama Varma Vañci Mahārāja, 1935. An independent work on dance.

119. *Vivekamārtaṇḍa* (Vedanta) by Visvarupadeva, 1935.

120. Śaunakīya, 1935.

121. *Vaikhānasāgama* (Tantra) by Marici, 1935.

122. Prabodhacandrodaya (Nāṭaka) of Kṛṣṇamiśrayati with the commentary Nāṭakābharaṇa by Sri Govindāmṛtabhagavān, 1936.

123. *Saṅgrāmavijayodaya* (Jyotiṣa), 1936. Of the 24 chapters of the work, the first 16 deals with Jyotiṣa, giving the proper time for a king to start on war. The rest deal with *mantra, yantra, auṣadha, śastra,* etc., for victory. The author have depended *Jayārṇava* another earlier work.

124. *Haramekhalā* of Māhuka with the commentary (Part I) 2-4 Pariccedas, 1936.

125. *Kokasandeśa* by Viṣṇutrāta, 1937. Deals with a Brahmin of Vāḷappalli in Malabar (Rambhāvihāra)

sending a message from Śrīvihāra to his beloved at Kāmārāma through a Koka bird.

126. *Karaṇapaddhati* by Putumana Comātiri, 1937. A comprehensive treatise on astronomy in ten chapers.

127. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* by Bhojadeva with the commentary of Srī Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha (Part II), 1937.

128. *Bhṛṅgasandeśa* by Vasudeva, 1937. A message poem deals with a message sent by the hero through a bee (bhṛṅga) from Trivandrum to Bālanīli (Uṇṇinīlī) the heroine residing at śvetadurga (Kottakkal),

129. *Hamsasandeśa* by Pūrṇasarasvati, 1937. A message poem in which a lady from Kāñcīpuram sends a message to Lord Kṛṣṇa residing at Vṛndāvana in 102 verses.

130. Mahānayaprakāsa, 1937.

131. *Vṛttavārtika* by Ramapāṇivāda, 1937.

The work deals with metres. The first part of the text consists of *Karikas* and the second part deals with the commentary containing explanatory sentences illustrative of them.

132. *Tantropākhyāna* (kavya), 1938.

133. *Udayavarmacarita*, 1938. On king Udayavarma of Kolattunad settling Brahmins in his country.

134. *Yogayājñavalkyam*, 1938.

135. *Sarvadarśanakaumudī* by Mādhavasarasvatī, 1938.

136. *Haramekhalā* of Māhuka with the commentary (Part II, Chapter 5), 1938.

137. *Skāndaśārīraka*, with the commentary, 1938.

138. *Āśvalāyanagṛhyamantravyākhyā* of Haradattamiśra, 1938.

139. *Prakriyāsarvasva* of Sri Narayana Bhatta with the commentary of K. Sāmbasiva Sastri (Part II), 1938.

140. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* (Vyakarana) by Bhojaḍeva with the commentary of Srī Narayana Daṇḍanātha (Part III), 1938.

141. *Sūktiratnahāra* by Kaliṅgaraja, 1938.

142. Vāstuvidyā (Śilpa) with the Laghuvivṛti commentary of K. Mahādeva Śāstri, 1940.

143. *Pāśupatasutra* with the Bhāṣya of Kauṇḍinya, 1940.

144. *Agniveśyagṛhyasūtra*, 1941.

145 *Kuvalayāvalī* (Ratnapāñcālikā) of Singabhūpāla (Nataka), 1941.

146. *Rāghavīya* of Rāmapāṇivāda, 1942. A Mahākāvya describes the story of Ramāyaṇa in 20 cantos.

147. *Ṛksamhita* with the commentary of Skandasvāmin and Venkaṭamādhava (Part III), 1942.

148. *Vākyapadīya* (3rd Kāṇḍa) of Bhartṛhari with the commentary of Helarāja, 1942.

149. *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* with the Vṛtti Sukhapradā of Ṣaḍguruśiṣya (Part I) 1 to 15 Adhyayas, 1942.

150. *Mīmāmsāślokavārtika* of Kumarilabhatta with the commentary *Kāśikā* of Sucaritamiśra (Part III) 1943.

151. *Tantrasamuccaya* of Cennas Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri with the commentaries *Vimarśinī* of Sankara and *Vivaraṇa* of Nārāyaṇaśīṣya (Part I) , 1945.

152. *Yogaratnasamuccaya* of Anantakumara (Part III), 1947.

153. *Prakriyāsarvasva* of Narayana Bhatta (Part III), 1948.

154. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhojadeva with the commentary Hṛdayahāriṇī of Nārāyaṇadaṇḍa nātha (Part IV), 1948.

155. *Aṣṭāṅgahṛdaya* of Vāhaṭa with the commentary *Hṛdayabodhikā* of Śrīdāsapaṇḍita (Part II-Sūtrasthāna, Chapters XVI to XXX), 1950.

156. *Jaiminīyasūtrārthasaṅgraha* of Ṛṣiputra Paramesvara III (Part I, Adhyāya I. Pāda 1 to Adhyāya III, Pāda.3), 1951.

157. *Mukundaśataka* of Rāmapāṇivāda (Not yet published)

158. *Meghasandeśa* of Kalidasa with the commentary *Sumanoramaṇī* of Ṛṣiputra Parameśvara (Not yet published)

159. *Kamalinīrājahamsa* (Rupaka) of Pūrṇasarasvati, 1948. An allegorical play in five acts dealing with the love between Rājahamsa, the king of swans, and Kamalinī, a lotus of the Pampa lake and their marriage.

160. *Sahityasāra* of Sarveśvarācārya, 1947. On Dramaturgy and Poetics in six sections called *Prakāśas*.

161. *Madanaketucarita* (Prahasana) of Rāmapāṇivāda, 1948. A Prahasana, deals with the love story of Viṣṇumitra, a Bhikṣu to Anaṅgalekhā, a courtesan and later rescued by a Kāpālika named Sivadasa.

162. *Laghubhāskarīya* of Bhāskarācārya with the commentary Vivaraṇa of Śaṅkaranārāyaṇa, 1949.

163. Jānāśrayī Chandoviciti, 1949

164. *Śrīrāmapañcaśatī* of Rāmapāṇivāda (Rāmaparaśava) with the commentary of Raman Nampidi and the Ṭippaṇī of Punnaśśeri Nīlakaṇṭha Śarma, 1951. Venkitasubrahmoniya Iyer. S, Kerala Sanskrit Literature- A Bibliography, p.88.

165. *Viṣṇuvilāsa,* A Kavya of Rāmapāṇivāda with the commentary *Viṣṇupriyā* 1951. A Mahākāvya in eight cantos, describes the first nine incarnations of Viṣṇu following the story of Bhagavata.

166. *Śeṣasamuccaya* by a disciple of Cennas Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri with the commentary *Vimarśini* of Sankara, 1951. A supplement of *Tantrasamuccaya*

dealing with the consecration and worship of some of the deities left out by Narayanan Namputiri.

167. *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* with the Vṛtti *Sukhapradā* of Ṣadguruśiṣya (Vol. II, 16-25 Adhyayas), 1952.

168. *Nītitattvāvirbhāva* of Cidānandapaṇḍita, 1953.

169. *Tantrasamuccaya* of Cennas Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri with the commentaries, *Vimarśinī* of Sankara and *Vivaraṇa* of Nārāyaṇaśiṣya, 1953.

170. *Mālatīmādhava* of Bhavabhuti with the commentary *Rasamañjarī* of Pūrṇasarasvati, 1953.

171. *Gurusammatapadārthāḥ* and *Kumarilamatopanyāsa*, 1954.

172. *Avantisundarī* of Daṇḍin, 1954.

173. *Bhīmaparākrama* of Sadānandasūnu, 1954.

174. *Prakriyāsarvasva* by Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (Part IV), 1954.

175. *Nṛgamokṣaprabandha* of Narayaṇabhaṭṭa, 1955.

176. *Aitareyabrāhmaṇa* with the Vṛtti *Sukhaprada* of Ṣaḍguruśiṣya (Vol.III Chapters 26-32),1955.

177. *Sivavilāsa* Kāvya by Damodara, 1956. A semi-historical poem in eight cantos, deals with the *Svayamvara* marriage of Uṇṇiyaṭī, the daughter of king Kerala Varma of Kayamkulam and Kuṭṭattī, a *Devadāsī* of Cerukara to Prince Rama Varma of Cochin. The work is so called because Uṇṇiyāṭī

was born as a result of the blessings of god Siva of Kaṇṭiyūr.

178. *Bhojanakutūhala* of Raghunātha (Part I, 17th Century), 1956.

179. *Uṣāpariṇayaprabandha* of Nārāyaṇan Nampūtiri of Iḷayiṭam, 1956.

180. *Gopikonmāda* (Anon.), a stotra, 1956. On the affliction of a Gopī separated from Kṛṣṇa who was later on taken to him by Narada, 122 verses in Mandākrānta metre.

181. *Tripuradahana* (Yamakakāvya) of Vasudeva with the commentary *Hṛdayagrāhiṇī* of Paṅkājākṣa, 1959.

182. *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa* of Bhojadeva with the commentary of Śri Nārāyaṇadaṇḍanātha (Part V), Not yet Published.

183. *Bhramarakāhalī* by Prabhākarācārya, 1957. A one-act play (rūpakaviśeṣa) on the marriage between Bhramara, a chief of Cheṅgannur and Kāhaḷī, a local beauty.

184. *Prajñālaharīstotra* by Sri Bhagavati Subrahmaṇya Śāstrikal of sucīndram, 1957. On Devi with a philosophical import in 100 verses.

185. *Āryabhaṭīyam* of Āryabhaṭācārya with the Bhāṣya of Nīlakaṇṭha Somasutvan (Part III, Golapada), 1957.

186. *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts* (Vol.I),1957.

187. *Harṣacarita* of Bāṇabhaṭṭa with the commentary *Marmāvabodhinī* of Raṅganātha, 1958.

188. *Tantrasaṅgraha* by Gargyakerala Nīlakaṇṭha Somasutvan (Somayājin) with the commentary *Laghuvivṛti* of Sankara Variar, 1958. In 8 chapters the work deals with all the major astronomical calculations based on *Dṛggaṇita* system.

189. *Nyāyacandrikā* of Sri Keśavabhaṭṭa, 1960.

190. *Advaitapañcaratna* (Upadeśapañcaka) by *Saṅkarācārya*, with the *Kiraṇāvalī* commentary of Bālakṛṣṇānandasarasvati, 1958. A summary of Advaitavedanta.

191. *Anaṅgajīvanabhāṇa* of koṭuṅṅallūr Koccunni Bhūpala, 1960. A Bhana type of rūpaka.

192. *Sitārāghava* by Rāmapāṇivāda, 1958. The Ramayana story is dealt with in a six act Nāṭaka.

193. Bhojanakutūhala of Raghunatha (Part II) Not yet published.

194. *Śri Bālarāmavijaya Campū* of Sītārāmakavi, 1961 The exploits of Bālaramavarma, the nephew of Rama Varma of Vaṭakkumkūr is dealt with in the work. The nature of welfare in the 17th century is also reflected in it.

195. *Abhijñānaśākuntalacarcā* (Anon.), 1961. A critical commentary on the Sakuntala, not earlier than 15th century.

196. *Kamalinīkaḷahamsa* (Rupaka) of Nīlakaṇṭhan Nampūtiri of Kūṭallūr, 1961. The marriage of Kaḷahamsa with Kamalinī, the daughter of Candra Varman is narrated in 6 acts.

197. *Śākinisahakārā campū* by Gopālakavi, 1961.

198. *Horābhiprāyanirṇaya,* 1962.

199. *Kālavadhakāvya* of Kr̥ṣṇalīlāśuka, 1962. A narration of the rescue of Markaṇḍeya from Yama by Siva of Tr̥ppāṅgod. Here Siva narrates the story to Kr̥ṣna and his cowherd companions.

200. *Tantrasamuccaya* of Cennas Nārāyanan Nampūtiri with the commentaries *Vimarśini* of Sankara and *Vivaraṇa* of Nārāyaṇaśiṣya (Part III), 1962.

201. *Aṣṭāṅgahr̥daya* of Vāhaṭa (Part III), 1962.

202. *Jvaranirṇaya* of Bhiṣak Nārāyaṇa Paṇḍita, 1963.

203. *Caturvedamahāvākyaṭīkā* - Cintāmaṇi of Ādinārāyaṇa, 1963.

204-207 *Sandeśacatuṣṭaya*- Kāmasandesa, Hamsasandeśa, Cakorasandeśa and Marutasandeśa, 1963.

208. *Ambikālāpa* (Kavya), Paramesvara of Mukundamaṅgala, 1963. Narrates Parvati's marriage in two sections of 70 and 63 verses respectively.

209. *Pūrvabhāratacampū* of Manaveda with the commentary of Kṛṣṇa, 1963. Deals with the story in the Ādiparva of Mahabharata, prior to the portion dealt with in Bhārata Campū, in 12 Stabakas.

210. *Adbhutapañjara* of Nārāyaṇa Dīkṣita, 1963.

211. *Stotrasamāhāra*, 1964.

212. *Bhāgavatacampū* of Ramapāṇivāda, 1964. Deals with the story from Kṛṣṇāvatara to Mucukundamokṣa in 7 Stabakas.

213. *Karaṇottama* of Acuta Piṣāraṭi, 1964. Deals with computations on the basis of *Dṛk* system in 5 Chapters.

214. *Śṛngārasundarabhāṇa* of Īśvaraśarma, 1965. A bhāṇa type of Rupaka.

215. *Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts*, Vol.II, 1986.

216. *Brahmādvaitaprakāśikā* of Bhāvavāgīśvara,1965.

217. Vasumatīcitrasenīya (Nāṭaka), Dr.K.Raghavan Pillai (ed.), 1965.

217. *Nīlakaṇṭhasandeśa* by Sridharan Nampi of Punnasseri, 1966. A message poem in which the Hero sends a message from Īṅṅayūr to his beloved at Ceruplasśeri through a peacock in 126 verses.

219. *Rāsotsava* of Mahiṣamaṅgalam Narayanan Namputiri, 1966. One of the most beautiful lyrics

in Sanskrit consisting of 220 verses in Vasantatilaka metre.

220. *Citraratnākara* of Cakrakavi with the commentary of Senāpati, 1967.

221. *Aitareyāraṇyaka* with Vṛtti of Ṣaḍguruśiṣya, 1968.

222. *Aṅkaṇaśāstra* (Navagrahasamaya) Anon., 1968. An astrological work in 4 chapters deals with the better reading of a horoscope.

223. *Praśnāyana* of Puruṣottaman Mūttatu of Kottaleṭam, (19th Century), 1968. A rare astrological work in 15 sections deals with *Praśna.*

224. *Vasulakṣmīkalyāṇa* (Nāṭaka) by Venkaṭa Subrahmaṇyāddhvarin, 1968. Deals with the marriage of King Rama Varma of Travancore with Vasulakṣmi, the princess of Sindhu. This drama is an amplification of another drama of the same name by Sadāśiva Dīkṣita.

225-33. *Prabandhasamāhāra* Part I. A collection of 9 Campūprabandhas of Melpattur Nārāyaṇa bhaṭṭatiri, 1971.

234. *Subālāvajratuṇḍam* (nāṭaka) of Sri Rama, 1971. Deals with the love of Vajratuṇḍa, a mice and Subāla. A satirical play in 5 acts.

235. *Śrīcihnakāvya* by Kṛṣṇalīlāśuka with the commentary *Bhaktivilāsa* of Durgāprasadayati, 1971. The 1st eight cantos illustrate rules of

Vararuci's Prākṛtaprakāśa and the remaining four illustrate the rules of Trivikrama's Prākṛt grammar.

236. *Stotrasamāhāra* Part II (19 Stotras), 1971. The Stotras are of high literary merit. They are: *Coraśailāṣṭaka*-in praise of goddess Durga at Coraśaila in 8 Stanzas. *Sakalajananīstava* in praise of Devī in 38 stanzas. *Sivastava* - 14 slokas in praise of Siva. *Anantastava* narrates the incarnation of Viṣṇu in 10 slokas. *Ambikāstava*- in praise of Devi in 25 stanzas. *Pūrṇatrayīśastotra* - in praise of Purṇatrayiśa in 46 stanzas. *Namaratnanavaratna mālikāstotra* - 11 Stanzas in praise of Pārvatī. *Śrīvidyāryāstotra*-34 verses in praise of *Śrividyā* in Āryā metre. *Gaṇādhipāṣṭakam*-in praise of Ganapati. *Skandadaṇḍakam* - in praise of Subrahmanya of Harippad temple. *Ambāstotram* - 18 stanzas in praise of goddess Durgā. *Lakṣmīśatakam*-in praise of goddess Lakṣmī. *Navaratnamālikāstotra*-10 stanzas glorify Śrikṛṣṇa. *Annapūrṇāstava* - 37 stanzas in praise of goddess Annapūrṇā. *Carcāstava* - 26 stanzas praising goddess Gaurī. *Chāyāvimśati* - 26 verses glorifying the several aspects of the goddess. *Śrikṛṣṇamuktakam* - the glory of Kṛṣna in 55 stanzas. *Gaurīdaśaka* in praise of goddess Parvati in 10 stanzas. *Māryaṣṭakam* - 10 stanzas in praise of goddess Kāli in her form Māri.

237. *Kṛṣṇīya* (Bhaktikāvya) Anon., 1973. A stotra addressed to Lord Kṛṣṇa of Guruvayur in 400 verses of *Sragdhara* metre summarising the Bhāgavata story on the model of Nārāyaṇīya.

238. *Kriyākrama* (Āśvalāyana Kriyākrama) of Melputtur Narayana Bhatta, 1974. An epitome of Gṛhyaprayoga of Kerala Brahmins in the Āśvalāyana sect of Ṛgvedins.

239. *Ātmollāsa*, Anon., 1975. A work on Advaitavedanta in the form of *Kārikas* in ten chapters called Ullasas, explains the principles of *Śravaṇa, Manana* and *Nididhyāsana* upon the significance of 'Tattvamasi'.

240. *Karaṇāmṛta*, (V. Narayanan Namputiri ed.), 1975.

241. *Paryāyapadāvalī*, Anon. 1975 (A. Ramachandra Sastri and M. Madhavan Unni Edts). A collection of synonimous verbal forms in 15 *Paricchedas*.

242. *Gurusammatapadārthasamkṣepa*,(V.G. Nambootiri ed.), 1975. A short treatise dealing with the categories in 250 stanzas according to Prabhakara.

243. *Kṛṣṇīya* of Kṛṣṇācārya with the commentary *Caturasundarī* of Viṣṇu (V.G. Nambootiri ed.), 1976. An important Kerala treatise on Astrology in 33 chapters.

244. *Uḍujātakodaya,* Astrology (K. Visvesvari Amma ed.), 1977. Consists of 104 *ślokas* in the *Miśraprakaraṇa,* 10 ślokas in the *Rāhudaśa*

prakaraṇa, II slokas in *Ketudaśaprakaraṇa*, 9 slokas each in the remaining *prakaraṇas.*

245. *Sarvamatasaṅgraha* (M. Madhavan Unni ed.) 1977.

246. *Mūṣikavamśa* of Atula, 1977. A Historical Kāvya in 15 cantos deals with the history of the Kolattunāḍu dynasty of kings till about 12th century A.D.

247. *Kṛtyaratnāvalī*, 1978.

248. *Dhāturatnāvalī*, Anon. (M. Madhavan Unni ed.), 1979. A collection of homonymous verbal forms having difference in their meanings.

249. *Prabandhasamāhāra* (Part II) A collection of the *Prabandhas* of Narayanabhatta of Melpattur (K. Raghavan Pillai ed.), 1980. A collection of 8 *Prabandhas* - *Santānagopala, Dakṣayāga, Kaunteyāṣṭaka, Ajamilāmokṣa, Kucelopākhyāna, Aṣṭamīmahotsava, Gajendramokṣa* and *Kailāsavarṇana.*

250. *Ācārasaṅgraha* (Astrology) of Paramesvara of Vaṭaśśeri illam (Visvesvari Amma ed.), 1981. 367 stanzas devided into 34 sections in which the important functions are treated.

251. *Kumārīvilasitam* (Drama) of Sudarśana (M. Madhavan Unni ed.), 1981. An Uparūpaka called Prekṣaṇaka on the holy deeds of Durga worshipped at Prapāpura.

252. *Kāryadīpikā*, Anon., (K. Appukuttan Nair ed.), 1981. A small treatise on Prābhākara school of Pūrvamīmāmsa.

253. *Bahuvṛttasaṅkṣepabhāratam* (S. Muralidharan Nair ed), 1983.

254. Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Vol. III,(T. Bhaskaran ed.), 1984.

255. *Viśākhatulābhāraprabandha* (A. Sumangala Bhai ed.), 1985.

256. Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts Vol. IV, (T. Bhaskaran ed.), 1986.

257. *Advaitāṣṭakam,* (T. Bhaskaran. ed.), 1987.

258. *Prakriyāsarvasvam* Vol. V, (T. Bhaskaran ed.), 1987.

259. Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts, Vol.V, (T. Bhaskaran ed.), 1988.

260. *Govindacarita*, (K. Visweswari Amma ed.), 1989.

261. *Rāmavarmavijaya Campū,* (P. Visalakshy ed.), 1989.

262. *Prakriyāsarvasva* Vol. VI, (K. Visweswari Amma, ed.),1989.

263. *Prakriyāsarvasva* Vol. VII, (M.Madhavan Unni ed.), 1992.

264. Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts Vol. VI, (K. Vijayan ed.), 1995.

265. *Citrarāmāyaṇa*, Anon, (K. Vijayan, ed.), 1997.

266. Alphabetical Index of Sanskrit Manuscripts. Vol. VIII, (P. Visalakshy, ed.), 2000.

267. *Rāmābhyudaya,* (P. Visalakshy, ed.), 2003. Mahakavya narrates *Rāmāvatāra* to his Paṭṭābhiṣeka in 2471 verses divided into 24 Cantos.

268. *Madanādinighaṇḍu,* (P. Visalakshy, ed.), 2005. Deals with medicinal plants and their use in treatment.

The catalogue published by the ORI and Mss Library in 2002 contains a list of 267 works under the TSS. But one is surprised to see the inclusion of the titles coming under the numbers 157 (in the press), 158 (in the Press), 182 (Not yet published), and 193 (not yet published) which have not been published so far. Number 157 and 158 seem to have entered in 1948 during the tenure of Dr. P.K. Narayana Pillai. Numbers 182 and 193 may have been included in 1957 and 1958 respectively during the period of Dr. K. Raghavan Pillai. Both of them have published several books after the inclusion of these unpublished titles. There is no reason to think that the Mss. of those unpublished titles in the TSS may have been given to the press at the termination of the tenure of a Curator or the work was not received by the Department after printing. Nor the successors of the above mentioned Curators have taken interest to publish those works.

Of the 263 actual titles, some are parts of the same work, others are collections consisting of several minor works. *Tantra Samuccaya*, *Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati*, *Arthaśāstra*, *Prakriyāsarvasva* are published partially under several numbers, while *Stotrasamāhāra* and *Prabandhasamāhāra* are collections of several minor works. TSS 1 to 87 were edited and published by T. Ganapatisastri. TSS.22 is a collection of five dramas, whereas TSS 23, 29 and 31 are parts of a single work. This is applicable to TSS 38, 43, 51 and 52; TSS 47,48,58 and 61; 67 and 71; 69,72,73,77 and 83 which are parts of Nāmaliṅgānuśāsana, Siddhāntasiddhāñjana, Tantra-samuccaya and Īśānaśivagurudevapaddhati respectively. Somany of the Sanskrit works have been published under the TSS, particularly the works of Kerala authors. For this, one should be thankful to the scholars who have sacrificed their lives for the sustenance of the TSS.

Reference:

1. Dr.S.Radhakrishnan, Address, Journal of the Travancore University Oriental Manuscripts Library, (JTUOML), Vol. V, No.2, 1949, pp.33-36.

2. Dr.V. Raghavan, Mahamahopadhyaya Dr.T. Ganapathi Sastri, JTUOML, 1949, No.2, pp. 37-41.

3. Dr. P.K. Narayana Pillai, The Univeiling of the Portrait of Mahāmahopadhyaya Dr.T.Ganapati Sastri, JTUOML, Vol. V. No.2, 1949, pp. 30-32.

4. Dr. S. Venkita Subramonia Iyer, Kerala Sanskrit Literature - A Bibliography, 19.

5. Dr. K. Vijayan, Kerala University Manuscripts Library, Journal of Manuscript Studies, Vol. XXXI and XXXII, 1990-91, pp.1-27.

ENNOBLEMENT OF CHARACTERS IN BHĀSA'S DRAMAS

(भासनाटकेषु पात्राणाम् उदात्तीकरणम्)

Dr.M. Sivakumara Swamy

One of the striking features of Bhāsa's dramas is ennoblement of characters. Since Bhāsa has taken his themes from the Ramāyaṇa, the Mahābhāratha, the Bṛhatkathā, the Purāṇa, the major characters of all his dramas have their respective personality traits in the sources. It is in the case of these characters who are depicted as villains of some sort or the other in the original sources that Bhāsa evinces lot of sympathy and understanding and tries to depict them in a better light. Such characters may be noted here: 1. Kaikeyī in the Pratimānāṭaka, 2.Vālin in the Abhiṣekanāṭaka 3. Karṇa in the Karṇabhāra and 4. Duryodhana in the Ūrubhaṅga. A critical glance at these characters will show Bhāsa's sense of keen insight into human personality and his faith in the innate goodness in human beings who behave in a certain way due to the pressure of the circumstances. It will also show how successful is Bhāsa in his attempt.

1. Kaikeyī in the Pratimānāṭaka

Kaikeyī, in the original Rāmāyaṇa, is a lady of selfish motives, stubborn in pressing for her demands and cruel in her intentions. It is of Mantharā's venomous advice that she turned out to be so. This is one opinion.

If her nature were not so, she would not have heeded to Mantharā's words. Mantharā succeeded only in flaring up the fire which was hidden in her. This Kaikeyī in the Rāmāyaṇa is condemned for her ignoble demand by her husband Daśaratha and her son Bharata. She demanded Rāma's exile for fourteen years and the coronation of her son Bharata as the heir apparent in return for the two boons which her husband had promised in the past.

Bhāsa introduces a change here, .He makes Kaikeyī ask for Rāma's exile and Bharata's coronation in return for the *Kanyāśulka* (bride's price) promised by Daśaratha. The most remarkable change which Bhāsa has introduced is in the direction of ennobling the character of Kaikeyī. Even this is held in suspense till the end keeping on the impression of Rāmāyaṇa's Kaikeyī throughout. She keeps her cool even when she is bitterly criticised by her son. Rāma remains his ideal self in not saying anything against Kaikeyī. On hearing about his father's sudden collapse from the Kañcuka, Rāma asks"कुत उत्पन्नोऽयं दोषः?'' The Kañcukin answers saying" स्वजनात् ।" Rāma asks: कस्य स्वजनशब्दो मे लज्जामुत्पादयिष्यति? When the Kañcukin says "तत्रभवत्याः कैकेय्याः'' Rāma remarks that if it is Mother Kaikeyī then there must be some sound reason - किमम्बायाः। तेन हि उदर्केन गुणेनात्र भवितव्यम् ।. It is the Kañcukin who goes beyond his limits to say कुमार! अलमुपहतासु स्त्रीबुद्धिषु स्वमार्जवमुपक्षेप्तुंम्। तस्या एव खलु वचनाद् भवदभिषेको निवृत्तः. When he persists in that Rama avoids him saying "अतः परं न मातुः परिवादं

श्रोतुमिच्छामि। Rāma is too good to think of any bad intentions on the part of Kaikeyī. It turns out to be true here thanks to the dramatist's ennoblement of Kaikeyī's character.

Daśaratha is squarely cross with Kaikeyī. He blames fate for three things, i.e., for giving him a son, for not making Rāma the son of another king and for not making Kaikeyī a tigress in forest - "अनपत्या वयं, रामः पुत्रोऽन्यस्य महीपतेः। वने व्याघ्री च कैकेयी, त्वया किं न कृतं त्रयम्। He was destined to die in such a situation without knowing the intentions of Kaikeyī as depicted in the drama.

Bharata's reaction is very bitter, expectedly so, because he is guided by his loyalty and respect towards his elder brother. First he comes to know about the death of his father through his statue in the *Pratimāgṛha* and then he meets his mother who, he was told, was responsible for it. Before the turn of offering his salutations to his mother comes, his anger towards her was gathering in strength. This is clear from what he says while showing his respects to Kausalyā and Sumitra - "अम्ब! अनपराद्धोऽहमभिवादये' - he says to Kausalyā. अम्ब! लक्ष्मणेनानुसन्धितोऽहमभिवादये' he says to Sumitra. Then comes the turn, Sumantra introduces Kaikeyī by saying "इयं ते जननी।" Bharata rises up in anger and condemns her by comparing her to a dirty river made to flow between Gaṅgā and Yamunā, i.e., Mothers Kausalyā and

Sumitra. Kaikeyī could only ask "जात, किं मया कृतम्?" Bharata sharply reacts to it. When Kausalyā reminds him that he should show respects to his mother, he bursts out saying असीत् पुरा। "Once she was my mother" and declares that he would set a new 'dharma' of considering a mother as a non-mother due to her betrayal of her husband - "भर्तुद्रोहादस्तुमाताप्यमाता।" Kaikeyī's defence says "जात महाराजस्य सत्यवचनं रक्षन्त्या मया तथोक्तम्।" She falls silent saying that she would explain her position at a proper place and proper time - जात! देशकाले निवेदयामि।''

The proper place and proper time come when Bharata himself comes to his mother's chamber. When Bharata's arrival is announced, Kaikeyī expects a new bout of condemnation from him. As expected Bharata gave the news of abduction of Sīta by Rāvaṇa with a pinching remark that it would certainly bring delight to her. Kaikeyī thinks that it was enough and decides to break the secret "भवतु इदानीं कालः कथयितुम् " She gives an account of how Daśaratha was cursed by sage who died on account of the death of his son in the hands of Daśaratha. It was a case of wrong identification by Daśaratha who discharged an arrow called 'śabdavedhī' at the sages son mistaking the sound produced by the fitting of his pot as that of an elephant. The curse was irrevokable. यथाहं भोस्त्वमप्येवं पुत्रशोकाद् विपत्स्यसे- was the curse. That meant a sure death for Rāma. To avoid that eventuality Kaikeyī had to take such a cruel-looking step. The inevitable in the case of Daśaratha happened. But

the inevitable that would have become its cause is averted with the change of situation from Rama's exile to the other world to his exile to the forest. Bharata is convinced after Sumantra said that all the elders, Vasiṣṭha, Vāmadeva, etc., who know about it had given their consent.

Thus the character of Kaikeyi is made noble. In the enthusiasm of ennobling the character of Kaikeyī, Bhāsa has introduced changes which open up some questions. Firstly, as revealed in the end, was it not a calculated move on the part of elders including Vaṣiṣṭha, Vāmadeva, etc., to kill Daśaratha, although with the good intention of saving the life of Rāma? The suggestion might have come from Kaikeyī with the same good intention. But how could the elders agree to it? Secondly, as Bharata raises the question, why Kaikeyi demanded for fourteen years of exile when fourteen days of exile would have brought out the same result? Kaikeyi's answer to this query is that in her state of mental agitation she said fourteen years instead of fourteen days. This answer is not at all convincing.

2. Vālin in the Abhiṣekanāṭaka:

The character of Vālin comes in the first act of the Abhiṣekanāṭaka. A character who is tinged with the guilt of ill-treating his younger brother and enforcing his claims over his brother's wife in the Rāmāyaṇa, Vālin continues to have the same taint in the drama sans the ferocity and arrogance that go with him in the epic.

Although a monkey, he is more humane in the drama than in the Rāmāyaṇa. This is noted by Rāma in his statement "भवता वानरेन्द्रेण धर्माधर्मौ विजानता"

Vālin is superior to Sugrīva in strength. When Rāma describes the valour of Vālin, Lakṣmaṇa tries to match it in words in his description of Sugrīva. The very next moment Lakṣmana observes how Sugrīva fell on being struck by Vālin. Hanumān in great anxiety appeals to Rāma to rescue his master from the clutches of vālin by reminding him of his promise: "बलवान् वानरेन्द्रस्तु दुर्बलश्च पतिर्मम। अवस्था शपथश्चैव सर्वमार्येण चिन्त्यताम्।।" The Lord of the monkeys (i.e., Vālin) is powerful and my master (Pati-Sugrīva) is weak. The condition (of Sugrīva) and the promise made, the noble lord should think of all that". In view of this what Vālin speaks about himself before Tāra is not a vain boast like that of Uttara before women. He told her that he was looked at with astonishment by the gods and demons when he dragged the great cobra (Uragendra) at the time of the churning of the ocean for nectar.

In his soaring self confidence, he did not heed to Tara's caution - "प्रसीदतु प्रसीदतु महाराजः। अल्पेन कारणेन न आगमिष्यति सुग्रीवः। तदामात्यवर्गेण सह संमन्त्र्य गन्तव्यम्।" She rightly judged that Sugrīva might have come with a strong ally. But Vālin slighted not only the caution given but also the possibility of the arrival of somebody like Rāma with his self-confidence of facing anybody like

Indra, śiva or Viṣṇu. "नालं मामभिमुखमेत्य सम्प्रहर्तुम्" was his confidence. There is a hint here of his special capacity of drinking in with his eyes the power of any enemy who stood face to face with him. That is why Rāma did not come face to face with Vālin and killed him by discharging his arrow at him by covering himself from his sight.

This inaugurates a significant conversation rather a debate, between Vālin and Rāma in which Rāma strikes a narrow win. Rāma defends his action on the ground that Vālin deserved to be killed by a trick because he was a beast. "वागुराच्छन्नमाश्रित्य मृगाणामिष्यते वधः। वध्यत्वाच्च मृगत्वाच्च भवान् छन्नेन दण्डितः।।" "Did you think that I deserved to be punished"? asks Vālin. "Yes" - says Rāma on the ground of "अगम्यगमन" (illicit relation with his brother's wife). While killing him the way he did Rāma looked upon him as a beast, while finding fault with him for "agamyagamana", he looks upon him as the knower of "dharma" and "adharma". This is indeed, glaring in view of what Vālin says - "अगम्यगमनेनेति। एषोऽस्माकं धर्मः। " If Vālin is guilty of "भर्तृदाराभिमर्शन", Sugrīva is equally guilty of it.

When Vālin raises this question saying - "तुल्यदोषयोः अहमेव दण्डितः न सुग्रीवः।'' "Rāma's reply is shrouded in mystery - "दण्डिचस्त्वं हि दण्ड्यत्वाद्, अदण्डयो नैव दण्ड्यते।" When Vālin asks - "सुग्रीवेणाभिमृष्टाऽभूत् धर्मपत्नी गुरोर्मम। तस्य दाराभिमर्शेन कथं दण्डयोऽस्मि राघव" Rāma's

reply is that forcing one's relation with younger - brothers wife was totally prohibited. Vālin stops the argument at this by saying that he had no reply to that - हत अनुत्तरा वयम् । Is it a taunt or an admission of defeat ?

Vālin is here totally transformed into a submissive devotee. He asks Rāma - "भवता दण्डितत्वाद् विगतपापोऽहं ननु।" Rama grants it. When Sugriva regrets Vālin turns into a forgiving brother and says "सुग्रीव! अलमलं विषादेन। ईद्दशो लोकधर्मः।" Hanūmān, Aṅgada and others paya their last respects. But before accepting death Vālin gives a piece of advice to Sugrīva:

"मया कृतं दोषमपास्य बुध्या
त्वया हरीणामधिपेन सभ्यक्।
विमुच्य रोषं परिगृह्य धर्मं
कुलप्रवालं परिगृह्यतां नः।।

Here is the nobility of Vālin as highlighted by Bhāsa. When he offers a golden necklace which represented family prestige to Sugriva saying "प्रतिगृह्यतामस्मत्कुलधनं हेममाला", his nobility shines the most.

3. Karṇa in the Karṇabhāra

Karṇa is depicted as 'dānavīra' in the epic mahābhārata as well as in the Karṇabhāra of Bhāsa. He was born and lived with ill-luck all along. Born as a son of Kunti in her pre-marriage experiment with *Sūryamantra*, he was abandoned as soon as he was born

due to fear of infamy. He had to grow up as Rādha's son (Rādheya) and bear the name 'Sūtaputra' belonging to the lower strata of society. It was that name which made him ineligible in the eyes of Droṇa to become his student. Duryodhana gave him a status as the king the Aṅgas not out of genuine love for him but with the motive of reserving his loyalty and shaping him as the real rival of Arjuna. For this courtesy shown, Karṇa becomes Duryodhana's shadow and supports him in all his misdeeds including the ill-treatment of Draupadi in the royal court of Duryodhana. Although born as a Kṣatriya, he had to suffer the infamy of the lowlyborn. He got the rare opportunity of learning "Astravidyā" under Paraśurama. But it ended in a curse for his resorting to falsehood. To Paraśurāma, who was a born enemy of Kṣatriyas, he had projected himself as a Brāhmaṇa. Mother Kuntī who never did anything to Karṇa as his mother, took a mother's fee (mātṟśulka) from him in the form of a promise that he would not use a missile again after once using it against Arjuna.

All these facts of Karṇa's life are represented by the dramatist in his drama. When the first opportunity in the war presented itself to him as the commander-in-chief, the first thing that he remembered was his duty towards Duryodhana. This was followed by his reflection on the target, which was Arjuna - "कर्तव्यं रणशिरसि प्रियं कुरूणां, द्रष्टव्यो यदि स भवेद्धनञ्जयो मे।।" To him who had the valour of Yama when he got angry, a dejection of some sort

dawned on his mind. He wondered at that - "क्रुद्धान्तकप्रतिमविक्रमिणो ममापि वैधुर्यमापतति चेतसि युद्धकाले।।" Thoughts that gathered in his mind at that time were those that tormented him throughout his life:

पूर्व कुन्त्यां समुत्पन्नो राधेय इति विश्रुतः।
युधिष्ठिरादयस्ते मे कनीयांसस्तु पाण्डवाः।।

He knew that it was the time for him to rise to the occasion and repay the debt of gratitude towards Duryodhana. But two things were added to his worry, firstly, that what he learnt from Paraśurāma was in vain and secondly, that his mother had taken a promise from him.

अयं स कालः क्रमलब्धशोभनो
गुणप्रकर्षो दिवसोऽयमागतः।
निरर्थमस्त्रं हि मया हि शिक्षितं
पुनश्च मातुर्वचनेन वारितः।।

When Śalyarāja, his charioteer, expressed his worry at that, Karṇa said that he was determined, for, he knew that death would bring heaven and victory would bring fame and that both were desirable and nothing was in vain in a battle.

हतोऽपि लभते स्वर्गं जित्वा तु लभते यशः।
उभे बहुमते लोके नास्ति निष्फलता रणे।।

One last attempt to get his last assets was made by Indra. Karṇa promised to offer thousands of cows and horses and a number of elephants, Indra did not accept because what he wanted from him were his inborn "Kavaca" and "Kuṇḍalas". When those two were snatched, Karṇa's death was assured. Karṇa knew that it was Śakra when the very core of his being was demanded. Yet he could not go back on his promise. He was pleased to think that even Indra had to stretch his hands before him. A messenger of Indra came and conveyed the promise of Indra for a missile called *Vimalā-śakti*. Karṇa asked as to when he would get it, the messenger said vaguely that he would get it when he wanted.

With all these suggestions, the dramatist hints at the inevitable end and concludes his drama. The portrayal of Karṇa's character is full of sympathy and understanding.

4. Duryodhana in the Ūrubhaṅga

Duryodhana's character in the Mahābhārata is a combination of a villain, Scheming politician and ambitious ruler who could stoop to any level to achieve his end. The incidents to demonstrate these features of his character are too well known to brook any repetition. Bhāsa has taken this character from such a background without giving up any of those features in his Ūrubhaṅga and has transformed him in such a way as to make amends for all he did and win the sympathy of the

readers or the spectators as the case might be. The description of the 'gadāyuddha' is the background set with three 'bhaṭas' sharing the details of that description. It is Duryodhana with his broken thighs and with his end fast approaching that catches our eyes and mind here.

It is that Duryodhana who accepted his fate without regrets and did not want any escalation of war or continuation of animosities further. Baladeva (Balarāma) who got enraged at gross transgression of the rules of war in Bhīma's striking at the thighs of Duryodhana, wanted to take revenge. At this Duryodhana said:

मा मा भवानेवम्-
प्रतिज्ञावसिते भीमे गते भ्रातृशते दिवम्।
मयि चैवं गते राम! विग्रहःकिं करिष्यति।।

The same is his statement when Aśvatthāma wanted to take revenge.

गतं धात्र्युत्संगे सकलमभिषिक्तं नृपकुलं,
गतः कर्णः स्वर्गं, निपतिततनुः शन्तनुसुतः।
गतं भ्रातृणां मे शतमभिमुखं संयुगमुखे,
वयं चैवं भूताः गुरूसुत! धनुर्मुञ्चतु भवान्।।

When Balarāma reacted by saying that he was enraged at the gross deceit meted out to Duryodhana before his very eyes, Duryodhana asked him as to whether he thought that he was deceived by Bhīma. This was only a preamble to say that he was not conquered by

Bhīma through deceit, but was made the captive of Yama by Hari who was dear to the world and who entered into the "gadā" of Bhīma.

When Dhṛtarāṣṭra and Gāndharī, the parents, Durjaya, the son and the queens, Mālavī and Pauravī, came to see him, Duryodhana was more disturbed as he could not stand up and greet the parents with the usual salutations. He was all the more disturbed when Durjaya his son wanted to sit on his lap. He said "अद्यप्रभृति नास्तीदंपूर्वभुक्तं तवासनम्" "From now onwards this seat which was enjoyed by you in the past, will not be there". The boy took that to mean that his father was going some where and asked where he was going. The father said that he would go where his hundred brothers had gone. The son wanted to go with him without understanding what his father meant. The boy must have become much more puzzled when his father said -"गच्छ पुत्र! एवं वृकोदरं ब्रूहि।" The piece of advice which Duryodhana gave to his son is in keeping with his character that is changed. "अहमिव पाण्डवाः शुश्रूषयितव्याः, तत्रभवत्याश्चाम्बायाः कुन्त्याःनिदेशो वर्तयितव्यः। अभिमन्योर्जननी द्रौपदी चोभे मातृवत् पूजयितव्ये।" As rightly observed by Balarāma Duryodhana's enmity had changed into repentance. This Duryodhana is so ennobled that he is not the Duryodhana of the epic.

SOCIAL BACKGROUND OF BHASA'S PLAYS

Dr. V. Sisupala Panicker

Drama composed mostly in prose, interspersed with a few verses expressing highly emotional experiences, marks the highest peak of poetic excellence in Sanskrit. It is widely said: नाटकान्तं कवित्वम्। The poetic merit should be judged by the composition of a drama. It demands great objectivity and concentration. With a great economy of words a play produces maximum effect. Kalidasa remarks: Nāṭya is the only visual performance that delights the mortals and immortals as well. He further states: the dramatic performance alone has the unique way of satisfying people having diverse taste in a variety of ways.[1] Hence nāṭaka in Sanskrit is accorded an elevated position by critics. Drama in Sanskrit is called a rūpaka since the characters are imposed on the actors and actresses. तद्रूपारोपात्तु रूपकम्

Bhasa who contributed 13 dramas is acclaimed as the father of Indian drama. Though Bhasa's plays were popular throughout India and they were referred to in the works and anthologies of other celebrated writers, it is really a pity that not even a single manuscript was preserved anywhere in the country. But we, Keralites are

proud to state that it was the late Mahāmahōpādhyāya Prof. T. Ganapathi Sastri traced out the manuscripts of the thirteen plays from the Maṇalikkara maḍham located in Padmanabhapuram, in the modern Kanyakumari District in 1909. After a careful study he presented before the world of scholars these thirteen plays as authored by Bhasa himself.

Based on certain internal and external evidences Ganapati Sastri convincingly established Bhāsa's authorship of these plays. As soon as he published these works, the issue turned out to be a "Bhasa Problem" in the academic circles. It became a topic of discussion among eastern and western scholars. These academicians were divided into three schools: i) supporters of Bhasa's authoriship, ii) Partial supporters, iii) antagonists of Bhasa's authorship. Still disputes on the subject continue with fresh arguments and counter arguments enriching our knowledge of Bhasa-literature considerably. Structural similarities, arrangement of vocabulary, remarkable similarity in social conditions etc lead us to arrive at a definite conclusion that all plays are the products of one and the same master-mind. All the plays are interlinked with a strong chain of similarity.[2] Besides the community of technique, language, style, ideas, treatment of sentiments, identity of names of dramatic

persone, prose, metrical passages and scenes are so remarkable that the conclusion of their common authorship is inevitable[3] Svapnavāsavadattā, one of the thirteen plays, universally accepted by all, as the composition of Bhasa falls within the "Bhāsanātakacakra". Certain famous stanzas oft-quoted by prominent writers are also found in these plays. Thus the authorship of these plays was fixed on Bhasa by Prof. T. Ganapati Sastri, on the basis of concrete evidences.

Bhāsanātakacakra

The thirteen plays first published by Prof. Ganapati Sastri were called Bhāsanātakacakra. On the basis of the gradual development of dramatic art and insight, the Bhasa plays can be classified under four stages. अभिषेकनाटक represents the first stage. बालचरितं, दूतवाक्यं पञ्चरात्रं and दूतघटोत्कचम् belong to the second stage of the development. अविमारकं मध्यमव्यायोगः चारुदत्तं and ऊरुभङ्गः fall under the third stage. प्रतिमानाटकं, प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायणं, कर्णभारं and स्वप्नवासवदत्तं represent the 4th stage and convey the message of the mature intellect of the author.

Based on the plot the plays can be divided under five heads: i). Mahābhārata plays - 6 nos दूतवाक्यं etc. ii).

Ramayana Plays - 2 nos. अभिषेक, and प्रतमा) iii) Kṛṣṇa Play- बालचरितम् iv)Folklore plays-2 Nos. अविमारकं and चारुदत्तम् v). Historical plays - 2 nos. प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायणं and स्वप्नवासवदत्तं All these plays exhibit great craftsmanship and deep insight of life.

Generally each Sanskrit playwright wrote only one or two or three dramas. The most gifted dramatist Kalidasa composed only three dramas. Bhavabhūti authored only two. Three plays were composed by Harṣa. Visakhadatta wrote only one drama. But we are lucky to get 13 plays from the talented pen of Bhasa. Besides each piece represents a particular variety of the ten rupakas. In all these plays Bhasa introduced more than 230 characters having great individuality of their own.

Date of Bhasa

The available sources do not enable us to assign a particular date to Bhasa. The dramas do not provide us with any information in this regard. On an analysis of the content of these plays and the sociological conditions reflected in them we can safely place Bhasa around 4th C B.C. Since Kalidasa refers to Bhasa with great veneration, it is certain that he preceeded Kalidasa. The observations found in Arthasastra can well be noticed in these dramas.

The grammatical rules laid down by Panini are not fully observed by Bhasa. Besides the conversational style of his dialogues, which are short, easy, graceful and colloquial also empower us to place Bhasa to a period earlier than that of Panini ie. to a time when Sanskrit was a spoken tongue, atleast among learned men. Assigning any date to Bhasa from 5th C BC to 4th C AD is not fully convincing for want of reliable evidences. Thus with the present state of our knowledge only this much can be asserted that Bhasa is an ancient Indian dramatist who flourished before Kalidasa. We are not in a position to assign him to a particular period for want of a thoroughly dependable data.

Bhasa and his personal history

Practically we do not know anything definite about the personal history of Bhasa. Pusalkar observes that Bhasa was the name of a gotra in the Haimodaka Division of Agstyagotra. He was a Brahmin, an orthodox follower of the caste system and a firm believer in the practice, utility and efficacy of scarifies. The epilogues of the dramas seem to suggest that Bhasa was a court poet of some king, rather than a king himself. He makes no mention of South India anywhere in his dramas. At the same time he refers profusely to the countries, towns and rivers and pilgrim centres of the North India. The four

fold classification of the society as ब्राह्मण, क्षत्रिय, वैश्य and शूद्र finds full exposition throughout these dramas. All these facts proclaim that Bhasa belonged to the northern part of India.

Social background of Bhasa's Plays

The dramas of Bhasa are the products of a matured intellect of a talented poet. Jagannatha Pandita points out that the poetic excellence or प्रतिभा of a poet alone constitutes the cause of poetry. In fact प्रतिभा is really a product of the then society. In that sense Bhasa and his dramas are the worthy products of the then prevailing social conditons. It is quite probable that the sociological conditions of a particular period have their reflections in the literary works of that age. A thorough and deep study of Bhasa's plays will reveal the social and cultural background of the period of their composition.

Caste System

The entire society was divided into four castes viz. Brāhmana, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and Sūdra. Thus four - fold classification of the society that prevailed in the vedic period continued its sway over the society. In the Rgvedic period caste was determined mainly on the basis of one's profession, not on one's birth. Later in the Brāhmaṇa

period birth became the only criterion for determining one's caste. Arthasastra speaks of the caste system based on karma. Though there were other sections of the society, they had no role in the functioning of the social fabric. Buddhism waged a battle against the caste system and the domination of the priesthood. But caste system was deep-rooted even in Bhasa's period. There is no mention of a mixed caste born of intercaste wedlock, though elaborated by Smrti works. Candalas are mentioned but they were kept outside the social system.

Brahmins

Brahmins were a privileged class enjoying all facilities and they were the intellectual leaders of the society. Study of the vedas was confined to them. The sacred thread or यज्ञोपवीतं was the distinguishing mark of a brahmin. It was not merely a thread but a piece of cloth. Learned Brahmins commanded respect and they were given priority on all occasions. A few references are given below - ब्राह्मणपुरोगासु सर्वप्रजासु[8], द्विजोत्तमाः पूज्यतमाः पृथिव्याम्[9], पूज्यतमः खलु ब्राह्मणः,[10] द्विजो भावन् क्षत्रियवंशजा वयम् ।[11]

The superiority of the Brahmins was deep-rooted in the minds of the masses. Even untrue statements emanated from him were regarded as true and he was

never to be contradicted. ब्राह्मणवचनमनृतमपि सत्यं पश्यामि[12] The words of Brahmins commanded implicit obedience. Karna says in Karnabhara: ब्राह्मणवचनमिति, न मया अतिक्रान्तपूर्मम्.[13]

The Brahmins were the gurus. It was the duty of the disciples to keep the guru above wants. All the wealth as also the religious merit of sacrifice were regarded as fruitless if the guru was not satisfied. It is said in Pancarātra:

किं तद् द्रव्यं कि फलं को विशेषो।
क्षत्राचार्यो यत्र विप्रो दरिद्रः।[14]

The law-givers had made charity an integral duty of the rulers. Sometimes the entire wealth of the king might be given off to the priests without extending any share even to his son. It is said in Pancarātra:

विप्रोत्सङ्गे वित्तमावर्ज्य सर्वं
राज्ञा देयं चापमात्रं सुतेभ्यः।।[15]

In Madhyamavyayoga Bhima offers his own body to the demon in lieu of a Brahmin. It is said: मच्छरीरेण ब्राह्मणशरीरं विनिमातुमिच्छामि[16]. Brahmins were exempted form capital punishments inspite of his committing a severe offence. Bhima says: सर्वापराधेऽप्यवध्यत्वान्मुच्यतां

द्विजसत्तमः ।[17] Most of the brahmins were learned in all Vedas and sastras such as Dharmaśāstra, Arthaśāstra, Yogaśāstra, Nyayaśāstra etc. It is said in Pratimanataka: ब्राह्मणसमुदाचारमनुष्ठास्यामि। साङ्गोपाङ्गं वेदमधीये, मानवीयं धर्मशास्त्रं, माहेश्वरं योगशास्त्रं, बार्हस्पत्यमर्थशास्त्रं मेधातिथेः न्यायशास्त्रं प्राचेतसं श्राद्धकल्पं च[18].

Illiterate brahmins were also found rarely. The vidusaka in Avimāraka remarks. It is difficult to come across a brahmin knowing both the word and its meaning.[19] The social set up that prevailed during the period of Bhasa is not far removed from the one presented by Kauṭilya in his Arthaśāstra.

Kṣatriyas

The kṣatriyas, the warrior class also occupied a lofty position, next to the Brahmins in the society. The protection of the subjects was the main duty of the kings. It is said in Karṇabhāra - तस्मात्प्राजापालनमात्रबुद्धया[20] The kings led an ideal life keeping all his subjects equal. It is said in Madhyama Vyāyoga: सर्वाः प्रजाः क्षत्रियाणां पुत्रशब्देनाभिधीयन्ते[21]. The riches of a kṣatriya are chiefly depended on his bravery. It is said: बाणाधीना क्षत्रियाणां समृद्धिः[22] Kings were advised to perform sacrifices which

world keep up their fame even after death. It is said : नष्टा शरीरैः क्रतुभिर्धरन्ते[23]

In the initial stage Brahmins and Kṣatriyas were in agreement to exploit the others. Later rivalry arose between the two classes when the exploitation of the Brahmins became intolerable to the ruling class. In Karṇābhāra Salya says: अस्ति भवतः क्षत्रियवंश्यैःपूर्ववेरम्[24] that is why Parasurama, a learned preceptor disagrees to instruct Karna simply because he was a Kṣatriya. It is said ब्राह्मणेषूपदेशं करिष्यामि न क्षत्रियाणामिति[25]

The Vaisya class is often referred to in Cārudatta, Balacarita and Pancarātra. They are carrying out trade and commerce even with foreign countries. There are references of florists, painters and washerman who come under vaisya class.

In Pratima and Pancarātra we get references of Sūdras. They were strictly prohibited from studying Vedas and chanting vedic mantras. It is said; वार्षलस्तु प्रणामः स्यादमन्त्रार्चितदैवतः[26] In Pancaratra also we meet with such a reference द्विज इव वृषलं पार्श्वे न सहते[27]

Caṇdalas are very rarely referred to. They stand outside the social set up. They had their residence outside the city beyond the cremation ground. However

there existed a cordial relation among men belonging to different castes. The onrush of Buddhism had not yet dealt a serious blow to the caste system in the period of Bhasa. Brahmin superiority was the rule everywhere and Buddhism was not much favour in those days.[28] Along with Varṇa the āśrama system was also followed.

Education

Gurukala system of education was practiced. A heavy curriculum was prescribed for the students. No fee was collected. The disciple should stay with the preceptor throughout his studies and he had to extend service in the house-hold affairs. In Karnabhara we get a reference of Karna's education under the guidance of Parasurama, the son of sage Jamadagni. It was the part of the daily routine of the student to help the Guru in collecting fruits, roots etc for their day to day use. Karna says: कदाचित् फलमूलसमित्कुशकुसुमाहरणाय भगवता गुरुणा सहानुगतोऽस्मि[29]. In Svapnavasavadatta also we get a reference of a Brahmacarin who happened to return to his house before completing his studies when fire broke out in the Lavanaka Village. Education was restricted only to the upper class.

Hermit Life

The hermitages were located in the dense forests, far removed from the din and dust of the towns. The inmates of these hermitages were self-contented. It is said in Svapnavasavadatta.

नगरपरिभवान् विमोक्तुमेते।
वनमधिगम्य मनस्विनो वसन्ति ।[30]

The doors of the āśramas were open to all. They were the tranquil abodes of freedom and abundance. Even wild beasts lived there cordially fully forgetting their mutual rivalry. Trees were protected with great care. The hermitages helped a lot in keeping the environment nature - friendly.

Position of Women

It has rightly been said that the culture and civilization of a period can be judged from the treatment accorded to women. The birth of a female - child was an honour and an occasion for great joy and not for sorrow as expressed in later writings. It is said: कन्यापितृत्वं बहु वन्दनीयम्[31], कन्यापितुर्हि सततं बहु चिन्तनीयम्[32] Married women undertook a number of fasts, religious observances and penances. They offered दक्षिणा to the

priests for the welfare of their husbands some times. Women had to sacrifice even their lives for the good of the spouses. Vasavadatta, the chief queen of king Udayana had to suffer a lot to recapture the lost Kingdom of her husband. She had to lead the life in incognito to pave the way for her husband to marry another princess, Padmavathy. Normally no woman will tolerate her husband sharing another woman. Immersed in grief Vasavadatta remarks: आर्यपुत्रोऽपि परकीयः संवृत्तः* [33]. This statement fully reveals her mental agony.

Social evils

Even though a high standard of morality prevailed in the peried of Bhasa social evils were not totally unknown. Gambling, prostitution and theft appear to have been in practice at least to some extent. In Carudatta we meet with Vasanthasena a cultured courtesan with sterling character, proficient in fine arts like singing, dancing and painting. Courtesans were generally more educated and better skilled in fine arts than the married women and hence gentlemen like Carudatta and Sarvilaka were attracted to them on account of their exceptional qualities.

Kings mostly depended on Ministers

Udayana, the hero of the play Svapnavasavadatta, is a Sacivayattasiddhi King. Udayana is interested more in music and hunting than in the administration of the Kingdom. As a result he lost his Kingdom. But the diplomatic efforts of his minister at last enable him recapture the lost Kingdom. When a brahmacari says that Vasavadatta was burned to death he does not verify whether the statement is true or not. He simply lies down on earth and laments bitterly like a child. Udayans is a typical example of kingship of that period.

The concept of Pratimāgruha

In प्रतिमानाटक, we have a reference of a प्रतिमागृह or a Statue House where the idols of the dead Iṣvāku kings like Dileepa, Raghu, Aja and Dasaratha have been kept. The practice of errecting pratimagruha is a novel phenomenon not met with anywhere in South India.

Belief in Jyotiṣa

People had firm belief in Astrology during the period of Bhasa. In the first act of Svapnavāsavadatta Jyotiṣa is refered to: - एषा सा मगधराजपुत्री पद्मावती नाम, या पुष्पकभद्रादिभिरादेशिकैरादिष्टा स्वामिनो देवी भविष्यतिति। In

Pratimānāṭaka when Bharata returns from his maternal uncle's house he was told to wait for the star Rohini, so as to enter the town. The star Kārtika is not so auspicious for entering a town. Even the day to day life of the people and their aspirations were greatly influenced by Astrology.

Conclusion

Bhasa, the father of Sanskrit drama, represents the social set up prevailing in his period. The entire society was divided into four classes viz Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya and śūdra. The Brahmins dominated the whole society by means of their intellectual supremacy. It was the duty of the warrior class to see that there was no violation of caste rules. The two upper classes were in agreement in exploiting the masses. Sometimes rivalry took place between the Brahmins and the Kṣatriyas when the exploitation of the former became intolerable to the latter. Education was strictly restricted to the upper class only. Gurukula system was also prevailed. Four-asrama system was practised. During the fourth stage people normally resorted to forest. The hermitages were and serene abodes of sages, located far away from the din and dust of the cities. The position of the women was not so poor as in the later vedic period. The birth of a female child was treated as an honour. Sometimes women had

to sacrifice their very lives to ensure the welfare of their husbands. Even though a high standard of morality prevailed, social evils like, gambling, theft etc were also practised. Kings were mostly सचिवायत्तसिद्धि and hence they were dominated by able ministers like. Yaugandharayaṇa. People were deeply influenced by Astrology. The idols of the departed Kings were kept in Pratima grhas. In short Bhasa has faithfully recorded the feudal social set up that prevailed in his period.

References

1. Kalidasa, Vikramovasiya Act I.
2. Pusalkar. A.D., Bhasa - A Study
3. Dr. Sarup, Hindustan Review, Patna, 1927, p.118.
4. Bisvanath Bhattacarya - A critical study of Bhasa's Mahabharatan Dramas, Calcutta, 1991; p.30.
5. Bhasa - A study, p.108.
6. यज्ञोपवीतेन ब्राह्मणः-अविमारकम्, p.85
7. यज्ञोपवीतमत्तपावरको............चारुदत्तम्, p.63.
8. बालचरिचम्, p.54
9. मध्यमव्यायोगः, stanza-9.
10. Ibid., p.30.
11. पञ्चरात्रम् । - 25.
12. बालचरितम् p.27.

13. कर्णभारम्, p.84.
14. पञ्चरात्रम्, I.28.
15 Ibid, I.22
16. मध्यमव्यायोगः, p.30.
17. Ibid., I.22
18. प्रतिमानाटकम्, p.99.
19. ब्राह्मणो दुर्लभो शब्दज्ञो अर्थज्ञो वा । अविमारकम्, p.16.
20. कर्णभारम्, p.47.
21 मध्यमव्यायोगः p.31.
22. पञ्चरात्रम्, I.34.
23. Ibid, p.31
24. कर्णभारम्,, p.5
25. Ibid, p.5.
26. प्रतिमानाटकम्, III-5
27. पञ्चरात्रम् I-6
28. Pusalkar. A. D. Bhasa- A Study, p.360.
29. कर्णभारम्, p.8.
30. स्वप्नवासवदत्तम् - I
31. अविमारकम्, I-9.
32. *Ibid.,* I-2.
33. स्वप्नवासवदत्तम्- V

SENTIMENT IN PLAYS ASCRIBED TO BHĀSA

Dr. P.V. Ramankutty

1. The Bhasa problem that continues to be beset with facts and fancies, still remains unresolved. There is no clinching, convincing and conclusive evidence to establish that the thirteen Trivandrum plays were penned by Bhasa, the celebrated dramatist referred to by great litterateurs like Kālidāsa, Dandin, Bāṇa and others. It has to be observed therefore, that the expression, 'Plays Ascribed to Bhasa'[1] is to be preferred to the one namely 'Bhāsa's Plays'. A student of Sanskrit literature is expected to refrain from making hasty sweeping conclusions until fresh corroborative evidence is unearthed to prove Bhasa's authorship of the plays or otherwise.[2]

2. There is near unanimity for the argument that *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* were authored by Bhāsa. *Svapnavāsavadatta* has been referred to by several dramaturgists and poeticians like Daṇḍin, Abhinavagupta, Śāradātanaya, Sāgaranandin, Rāmachandra and Guṇachandra and a host of others.

But the presently available editions of these plays have undergone great change from their originals. All the plays except *Svapna* and *Pratijñā* have some fault or other. The *Ūrubhaṅga* has got as many as 66 Stanzas in a single act.[3] Most of the plays are of a prosaic cast[4]. But swift and smooth is the progress of the story in these

plays. Descriptions are endowed with brevity and simplicity. The heroic characters have a touch of vigour and liveliness.

3. The concept of gradual development of a chief sentiment in a drama to its happy climax, enunciated by texts on dramaturgy, is not found in most of the plays ascribed to Bhāsa.

4. The traditional dramatic criticism in Sanskrit revolves round the significance attached to Vastu (plot), Netā (Character) and Rasa (Sentement). Neta means one who leads and drives all the thematic factors to their fruitful end. Pātra-character, is conceived to be a vessel by means of which the spectator sucks in Rasa. Of these three factors, dramaturgists hold that Rasa alone is primary and indispensable.

5. In the plays ascribed to Bhāsa with exception to *Svapnavāsavadatta*, the art of thematic novelty ingenioulsy effected through noteworthy deviations to stories taken from epics and folk tales, is a remarkable feature. Another factor of the plays is the richness and variety of characterisation.

6. Incidents follow one after the other in quick succession in the plays ascribed to Bhasa. Here the following points deserve to be noted:

The common prevalent view about Sanskrit plays is that it should be devoid of the following aspects:

i) violent actions

ii) shocking scenes

iii) shameful episodes

iv) gross demonstrations of anything revolting.

Sanskrit plays generally present a sense of perfect decorum and decency. It is to be analysed whether the plays ascribed to Bhasa generally exhibit such qualities:

The Dūtavākya has the picture of the 'draupadīkeśāmbarakarṣaṇa' hung on the stage and Duryodhana often looks at it congratulating the dexterity displayed by the artist in drawing the picture. The scene in *Ūrubhaṅga* wherein Duryōdhana crawls near Balarāma bleeding profusely in order to pacify him and the hero's subsequent death may sound to be contrary to the general concept of Sanskrit plays elucidated above. In *Abhiṣekanāṭaka*, the duel between Bāli and Sugrīva and the former's death at the hands of Rāma is another similar scene. In Pratimānāṭaka, the death of Daśaratha is shown on the stage. The play *Bālacarita* is a melodrama of violence and ferocitiy. A series of murders is presented on the stage. The body of an infant is shown as being struck on a rock. The child bursts into two one half falling to the ground and the other rising into the sky. There is another scene wherein Kr̥ṣṇa kills Cāṇūra and Muṣṭiaka. Again, in another scene, Kr̥ṣṇa catches hold of Kamsa's head and strikes him down dead. All of them are against the established code of conduct of Sanskrit drama.

7. Polished lyrics with careful development of cause and effect are generally lacking in the plays which explains the apparently secondary significance attached to Rasa in them unlike in the plays of Kalidasa or Bhavabhuti. Analytical and elaborate studies on the literary and poetic merits on the plays ascribed to Bhāsa are also scarce.

8. It has been stated by several scholars that the thirteen Trivandrum plays are of the nature of adaptations and abridgements made on the stage[5]. The plays, probably, had been penned with an eye on the spectators and not on the readers. The observation made by several scholars that the plays might be the creations or 'acting versons' of Keralite Cākyārs assumes significance in this connection. The prime aim of these actors were not to instill a peculiar aesthetic experience but to provide maximum mobility for the actors on the stage for which rapid succession of incidents was essential. Plays like *Dūtavākya, Karṇabhāra, Madhyamavyāyoga Dūtagha-totkaca, Bālacarita* and *Pratijñayaugandha- rāyaṇa* are fine examples for such a proposition. The peculiar nature of these plays also indicates the possibility of the existence of living theatre tradition in Kerala. This stage-fights, death and murder scenes and several other factors prohibited by dramaturgists to be enacted on the stage, corroborate the argument that most of the thirteen plays are the stage-versions of actors. The beginning stanzas of *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Pratimānāṭaka* are too clusmy to have been composed by a playwright like Bhāsa. These

stanzas were obviously the creations of the actors who used to produce the plays. Some of the plays have also a tragic end[6].

9. Another significant factor seen in the plays as we analyse the delineation of Rasa in the Trivandrum plays is that the author has given only secondary significance to the erotic sentiment which is depicted only in the *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Avimāraka*. As has been observed earlier, the *Avimāraka* is not a fine dramatic work, but the *Svapnavāsavadatta* is the best.

10. The author or the authors of the plays have a liking for the Vīra or the heroic sentiment which is the principal emotional mood in 11 out of the 13 plays. The *Karṇabhāra* has a steady flow of the pathetic sentiment that enlivens the heroic.

An important point needs to be highlighted in this context. In the *Karṇabhāra* the dramatist with a view to making the play more dramatic, has shifted the episode of Indra's taking Karna's *Kavaca* and *Kuṇḍala* to the last day of the latter's life as he goes to meet Arjuna in a final encounter. So, according to the play, it is in the last day of his life that Karṇa gets the unfailing *'Śakti'* from Indra. He can very well use it against Arjuna in the final battle. But in the Mahābhārata, the episode happens quite earlier and it is with the *'Śakti'* that Indra offers to Karma that the latter kills Khaṭotkaca. So the dramatist's overenthusiasm in shifting the episode to the last day of Karna's life in order to effect a more dramatic

denouement to the play, misfires and it results in an incompetent and improper handling of the epic theme. This can not be displayed as a dexterous display of dramatic skill on the part of the dramatist. On the contrary, it exposes the inferior dramatic art of the author. This, again, points to the fact that the play could not have been authored by a playwright like Bhāsa.

11. In determining and applying the dominant sentiment in a drama, several factors need to be taken into account. In Sanskrit dramas it is the states or *Avasthas* of characters that are imitated and not action as is seen in Aristotle's concept of drama wherein he defines tragedy as the imitation of an action that is serious. So Bharata gives significance to *Avastha* and Aristotle to Kriyā or Action. The authors of *Daśarūpaka* and *Bhāvaprakāśa* have pointed out that drama imitates Avastha: Avasthānukirnṛtirnāṭyam........Dhanañjaya.

Avasthānukṛtāṭyamiti nāṭyasāmānyalakṣaṇam .

Śāradātanaya.

The observation of Bhaṭṭatuata, the preceptor of Abhinavagupta is a noteworthy one since he uses the word, 'anuvyavasāya' instead of 'anukaraṇa'. What happens on the stage is neither real nor unreal. It is something which is 'Sākṣātkārakalpa'. Unless the spectator has the consciousness that the occurrence on the stage is something artificial, there can be no drama at all. But at the same time the artificial is felt to be natural

without which one cannot have the peculiar dramatic experience also.

12. When we consider Rasa in the *Svapnavāsavadatta* the following factors need to be taken into account:

i) The emotional stream with respect to each significant character is to be considered, that is, the chief sentiment is to be viewed from the points of view of each dominant character in the play.

ii) Karuṇa also is dominant when viewed from the painful experiences undergone by Vāsavadattā. The sentiment of pathos is ultimately complementary to Sṟngāra.

iii). Both *Sambhoga* and *Vipralamba Śṟngāra* are portrayed in the play. Sambhoga Sṟṇgāra is in relation to Padmāvathi and Vipralambha with respect to Vāsavadattā.

iv). The sentiment of hāsya is also dominant when the part played by Vidūṣaka is considered.

v). So the chief sentiment of Sṛngāra pertaining to the hero, gets heightened and intensified by several emotional streams represented by dominant characters in the play.

vi). In an analysis of the *Avashtās* in *Svapnavāsavadatta*, the *Ārambha*, depending on the seed, is seen in Act I, Verse 4. The undertaking or Prayatna is there where Udayana's marriage with Padmavathy is fixed which

leads to the restoration of the king's lost kingdom[7]. Prāptyāśa or possibility of attainment, begins where Vāsavadattā learns that Udayana still loves her in act IV. Niyatāpti or certainty of attainment of the fruit comes in the dream scene in Act V and the attainment occurs where Vāsavadattā is finally united with Udayana in Act VI. The combination of *arthaprakṟtis* and *avasthās* is finally united with Udayana in Act VI. The combination of *arthaprakṟtis* and *avasthās* constitute the various junctures or *sandhis* which thus makes the perfect design of the drama. Such a perfect design is ineviatable for the steady flow of the sentiment in the plays.

13. Life is a peculiar phenomenon beset with the operation of the pair of opposites. A balance between such contradictory impluses is brought out by great literature. Great works instill such a harmonious balance in the mind of a true connoisseur. Again, such a grand conception is generally lacking in the thirteen Trivandrum plays with exception to *Svapnavāsavadatta* and perhaps Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa. Most of the plays do not have that peculiar graceful philosophical undercurrent experienced in the dramas of great playwrights. Thus the scope of Rasa is quite meager in most of the plays ascribed to Bhasa though some Rasa or other can be somehow extracted from the works.

14. In conveying the dramatic experience, the role of the actor is formidable. It is his dexterity achieved through

incessant training that helps generating Rasa. The way he acts is artificial. But it is not felt to be so. This is explained by Śankuka as he tries to establish his 'Anumitivāda'.

15. The view that there is no basic difference between the experience one begets from a drama or a Kāvya does not seem to be true since there seems to be some distinction to the dramatic experience from the poetic, for the former is a collective one.

Conclusion:

So, from the literary point of view it deserves to be judged that only *Svapnavāsavadatta* and *Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa* could be the works of Bhāsa and it is pointless to analyse the delineation of Rasa in other plays. It is true that these plays present a deviation from the beaten track and breathe an air of novelty, but the craft and literary merit seem to be an inferior nature. As has been observed by Dasgupta, *Svapna* and *Pratijña* are fascinating plays in which the dramatist has an unlaboured, but not forceless art that makes a direct human appeal[8]. The other plays, at the most, can be said to possess only an unmistakable dramatic quality.

References

1. A majority of scholars refer to the plays as 'plays ascribed to Bhasa'.

2. Winternitz first supported Bhasa's authorship of the plays but later withdrew from it. Dr. N.P. Unni has shown that the colophon of one of the manuscripts of *Avimaraka* unambiguously says that its author is one *Katyāyana*. See his New Problems in Bhasa Plays pp. 94-107 College Book house, M.G. Road Tvm, 1998.

3. M.P. Sankunni Nair has pointed out that Ūrubhaṅga is an act of another Sanskrit drama. Its name in Śākuntalācarcā is 'Gadāyuddha.' See his article on the thirteen Trivandrum plays is Nāṭyamaṇḍapa.

4. A History of Sanskrit Literature: Classical Period, Gl. Editor, S.N. Dasgupta, University of Calcutta, 1962.

5. M.P. Sankunni Nair has pointed out that the verses in some plays have in them the peculiar Kerala practice of Dvitīyākṣaraprāsa.

6. A.K. Warder has observed in Indian Kavya Literature that the 'plays might have been written in the South perhpas as much as a thousand years after Bhāsa by some anonymous dramatist'.

7. The analysis is taken from A.K. Warder, op. cit. pp. 286-87.

8. Dasguptha op. cit. p. 117.

IRREGULAR USAGES IN BHASA PLAYS

Dr. P. Narayanan Namboothiri

Patañjali the author of *Mahābhāṣya* has stressed the need to follow the correctness of words while describing the purpose of the study of *Vyakarana*. The rhetoricians also have given much attention for the usages made by poets to ascertain the merit of their work. Minor deviations affected in *svara, varṇa,* and *samskara* on the course of utterance may cause severe harm. From the statement of *Bhāṣyakara* one can see that utmost care should be applied while writing or uttering a sentence. *Smṛtikāra*. Further extends his view that *apabhāṣaṇa,* wrong utterings will cause for *pratyavaya*. Having thus seen the inner senses of the word i.e., *śabdabrahman* the scholars of aesthetics have throned the grammarians in the first place. As a systematically arranged treatise *Aṣṭādhyāyī* is considered as a scale to verify the validity of words. It is believed that *Panini* brought out this work after taking several concepts from his predecessors and having experienced the usages in several regions so as to represent the ideas for the coming generation.

Though the study of grammar is essential to poets, some rhetoricians like *Rājaśekhara* and *Vāmana* have given some relaxations for the smooth preparations of

their poem. *Vāmana* in his *Kāvyālaṅkārasūtravṛtti* has tried to show the correctness of certain words from the passages of well known poets even though they are grammatically wrong spelt. There he has exempted the relevance of *Pāṇinian sūtras* for the sake of *matra*, easiness in pronunciation and to make them free from ambiguity.

A Keralite scholar has brought out two works namely *Mukhabhūṣana* and *Ārṣaprayogasadhutva nirnaya* as a hand book to the poets. In *Mukhabhūṣaṇa* the author has given reliable explanations for the technical terms *samhita* and *vivakṣa* which influence the operation of sutras related to *sandhi, kārāka* and *samāsa*. In order to show the relevance of his findings he has given justifications with examples. Anyhow we are not informed the name, place of birth or date of this poet. Dr. Kunjunni Raja has placed him between 12th and 14th century A. D.

In the second book *Ārṣaprayogasādhutvanirṇaya* he quotes several passages from *Itihasas* and *Purāṇas* which are not coming under the purview of grammatical explanation. He attempts to illustrate the correctness of these usages with the help of the technical term *Bahula* which come under the topic *Vaidikaprakarana*.

The multi dimensional function of *Paninian sutras* are explained by this rule.

सुप्तिङुपग्रहनलिंगराणां कालहलच् स्वरकर्तृयशं च

व्यत्ययमिच्छति शास्त्रकृदेषां सोपि च सिध्यति बाहुलकेन

So this scholar has removed the answer 'आर्षत्वात् साधुः' for the unanswered questions regarding the usages of *Valmiki* and *Vyasa.*

The merit of *Astadhyayi* lies in its arrangement, its techniques and the concepts regarding the science of language introduced by *Panini.* The qualities and perfectness of this treatise made several followers of *Astadhyayi* and the text became the supreme authority of Sanskrit language.

In 17th century *Narayana Bhatta* of *Melpattur* wrote a small book in the form of a letter named *Apāṇinīya pramāṇa sādhanam.* In this letter he addresses the scholars of *Coladesa* to settle the dispute regarding the appraisal of certain words which are not relevant as per the rules of *Panini*. Here *Bhattatiri* puts forward his theory that

पाणिन्युक्तं प्रमाणं न तु पुनरपरं चन्द्रभोजादिसूक्तं

केऽप्याहुः तल्लधिष्टं न खलु बहुविदामस्ति निर्मूलवाक्यम्

बह्वङ्गीकारभेदो भवति गुणवशात् पाणिनेः प्राक्कथं वा

पूर्वोक्तं पाणिनिश्चाप्यनुवदति विकल्पेपि कल्प्यो विकल्पः

So according to him learned scholars will not utter a single word without having some principles behind them: So we should consider them valid because *Panini* himself has done the same work in his operation. These three works have emphasized the need of acceptance of poetical expressions upto a certain extend. They have also suggested to check other grammatical work for validity of words.

In this paper an attempt is made to list some irregular constructions of Bhasa spread over his plays and tried to find out some solutions. It is also believed that the role of a grammarian is not to find fault with the usages, but to explain them with relevant rule from grammatical works. Such a broad outlook on language will help him to recognize his position in the vast world of literature.

१ अपरिचयात्तु न शिलष्यते मेनसि

Here , the *atmanepada* termination in the case of अ-श्लिष् is not valid. Because it falls under the other group.

The classification of *atmanepada* and *parasmaipada* was done according to describe the dual nature of these roots. In *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* we

can see several usages in both termination without any change in meaning.

युक्ता रामस्य भवती धर्मपत्नी यशस्विनी

प्रतिसंदिश मॉ देवि गमिष्ये यत्र माधवः (युद्ध 6. 101. 39)

श्रृणुष्ववहिद्धितो राज्ञस्तस्य महात्मनः (महा-3. 126.4)

Impact of the verses from *Itihasas* might have prompted him to use in such a way.

2 आपृच्छामि भवन्तौ

Here the *parasmaipada* formation is not valid as per the rule आङि नु प्रच्छयोः Here the transformation of *atmanepada* to *parasmaipada* may be caused by the influence of

सर्वे तथा वक्र एवाभ्यजायन्

अष्ठावक्रः प्रथितो मानवेषु (महाभारतम्)

So from these explanation the division of *atmanepada* was followed as a way to explain the usages in *Itihasas* by *Panini*. Being a follower of *Veda* and *Itihasa Bhasa* used them without any limitations.

3. यदेष भणति तदनुष्ठत्वार्थः is a sentence which is wrongly pronounced. अनुतिष्टतु is the correct usage.

4. Generally accusative case should be employed in sentences when they are modified by the words like

अभित, परित... by the rule अभित परित समयानिकषा. But in *Bhasa* play we come across अभित इव ते in the place of त्वाम्. Differences in cases is a matter in all branches of literature.

स्वर्गादुपरिलोकानाम् गत्वा गोलोकमाश्रितः चित्तार्द्रत्वमूतेः

5. According to the *Varttika* क्रियया यमभिप्रैति, the usage should be as स्वागतं राजदारिकायै in the place of स्वागतं राजदारिकायाः

Some irregular formations in the compounds can also be seen in *Bhasa* plays e.g. अवन्त्याधिपतेः. In the formation of compounds mutual. Expectancy is considered as the most important factor. But at the end of the *samāsa* we are informed that some forms must be listed in the group of *samasa* even though the rules are not applicable to them सापेक्षत्त्वेपि गमकवात् समासः प्रसज्य्प्रतिषेधः निदुच्य कर्णी are some examples. *Panini* has framed a *gana* in order to attribute their grammatical validity though the rules are seldom seen. The word *citraphalaka* which is in neuter has been changed into feminine as गमक चित्रफलकायां अथ च आवाभ्यां तव च वासवदत्तायाश्च प्रतिकृतिं चित्रफलकायां आलिख्य विवाहो निर्वृत्तः In such occasions commonly accepted answer is निरङ्कुशा कवयः

The word हित must be followed dative case by the rule हितयोगे च But *Bhasa* has used this along with sixth case नृपतेर्हितार्थम्

महाराजस्य हितमन्तरेण अस्ति काचित् विवक्षा

कस्यार्थः कलशेन को मृगयते वासो यथा निश्चितम्

In this *sloka* also the word अर्थ should be followed by dative case ending.

It is to be noted that all the examples mentioned above show a violation of the *varttika* made by *Katyayana* who lived in 3rd centuary B. C. Due to the influence of *Vedic* texts and *Itihasas, Bhasa* has composed these plays accordingly to the popular usages.

It may be concluded that the illustrations given on each irregular usages of *Bhasa* will suffice to recognize the place of a true follower of *Vyakarana*.

Reference

आर्षप्रयोगसाधुत्वनिर्णयः।

मुखभूषणम् ।

अपाणिनीयप्रमाणसाधनम्।

महाभाष्यम्।

वैयाकरणसिद्धान्तकौमुदी।

भासनाटकानि

BHARATA IN PRATIMĀNĀṬAKA OF BHĀSA

Dr. P. Visalakshy

Among the thirteen plays ascribed to Bhāsa by Dr. T. Ganapati Shastri, *Pratimānāṭaka* might be the second in popularity as far as the Kerala region is concerned. This assumption is due to the fact that 48 manuscripts of this drama have been obtained from different parts of Kerala. Based on the number of manuscripts obtained, *Abhiṣekanāṭaka* occupies the first position having 50 manuscripts. Since the theme of *Pratimānāṭaka* is based on Rāmāyaṇa story and Sītā is the heroine, one may have to consider Rāma as the hero of this play. Rāma appears in the acts 1,4,5 and 7. However, the most prominent character in Pratimānāṭaka is Bharata and he also has appearances in equal number of acts as that of Rāma. Bharata appears in acts 3,4,6 and 7. It is worthwhile to note that Bhāsa portraits Bharata as a person having close resemblance to Rāma in physical appearance and also in voice. Even Sītā feels so when Bharata says आर्ये अभिवादये, भरतोऽहमस्मि (Act IV). Sītā's soliloquy न हि रूपमेव, स्वरयोगोऽपि स एव proves this fact. (Act IV). Through the lines.

मुखमनुपमं त्वार्यास्याभं शाशाङ्कमनोहरं

मम पितृसमं पीनं वक्षः सुरारिशरक्षतं।

द्युतिपरिवृतस्तेजोराशिर्जगत् प्रियदर्शनः

नरपतिरयं देवेन्द्रो वा स्वयं मधुसूदन।। (IV-8)

Bhāsa draws Bharata's similarity to Rāma and Daśaratha. He also describes the charming personality of Bharata. In this context it is worthwhile to note the observation of Prof. C.R. Devadhar that the drama may have been named 'Pratimā' as Bharata is represented as the very pratimā of Daśaratha and very similar to Rāma so as to create allusions on various occasions in the minds of Devakulika, Sumantra, Lakṣmaṇa, Sītā etc".

Depiction of external similarity of Bharata almost identical with that of Rāma might be done by the dramatist in order to drive home the point that Bharata is also as noble as Rāma in character and Bharata too is to be considered as a 'Maryādapuruṣa'. Bhāsa's portrayal of the personality of Bharata is quite striking. As in Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa, here too, he is above from all selfish motives. Though he is valorous Bharata is characterised as a very sentimental person having great affection and attachment to his immediate relatives. Any suffering caused to them makes Bharata disturbed. While recognising the fourth statue in Pratimāgṛha as that of his father (III-8) and thus realising his father is no more he faints but suddenly recovers. Again swoons when he knows that the reason for his father's death and the exile of Rāma with Sītā and Lakṣmaṇa is his mother Kaikeyī. Thinking about the adverse reactions of the people of Ayodhya on his

mother's actions he became agitated and faints again. So also he fell unconscious while knowing the news of the abduction of Sītā by Rāvaṇa through the words of Sumantra "सीतामायामुपाश्रित्य रावणेषु ततो हृता (VI-11).

Bharata's behaviour in all these occasions appears to be that of a very week-minded person though he is not really so. Bhāsa portraits such scenes only to show the intensity of his love and affection towards his near and dear and also to the people of Ayodhya. He considers the well being of such people as more important than that of his and unable to withstand even slightest hardship to them.

Unlike in the case of many other ordinary mortals, the sentimentalism in his case does not deter him from taking firm decisions and on the spot actions. This is evident from the fact that he shows respect to Kausalya and Sumitrā but not offering respect to his own mother Kaikeyī while they came to *Pratimāgṛha.* His rejection of the throne without any wavering, his firm conviction that Rāma should be the king of Ayodhya, his immediate departure to the forest to request Rāma for returning to Ayodhya and to occupy the throne are examples for his ability to take quick and stern decisions. He strongly believes that नायोध्या तं विनायोध्या सायोध्या यत्र राघव (III - 24) So also, Bharata's ability to take timely action can be understood through the lines.:

वेलामिमां मत्तगजान्धकारां

करोमि सैन्यौघनिवेशनद्धाम्।

बलैस्तरद्भिश्च नयामि तुल्यं

ग्लानिं समुद्रं सह रावणेन।। (VI- 16)

This decision for an expedition with a large army against Rāvaṇa is taken by Bharata as soon as he hears the news of kidnapping Sītā and it is taken even without waiting for Rāma's order or for any confirmation of war between Rāma and Rāvaṇa.

Like Rāma, Bharata is also very conscious of the traditions and practices of Ikṣvāku family and is quite particular to uphold its veracity. Through his discussion with Rāma, Bharata understands that Rāma's exile is to execute his father's boon and realises that he too has a responsibility of fulfilling the desires of his father. Thus it is purely for the sake of keeping up the great tradition of his family he agrees to return to Ayodhya and rule the country until Rāma's return from the exile.

Bharata is very humane and is very tolerant and he repents for improper actions if any committed by him and even ready to beg pardon for the same. This can be understood when Kaikeyī explains to Bharata that her actions were intended only to fulfill the curse of Daśaratha that he has to die through the grieving of his son. This is also clear from the lines. यथाहं भोस्त्वमप्येवं। पुत्रशोकाद् विपत्स्यसे (VI - 15). Then Bharata grieves for his

harsh actions and words used against his mother and requests her to pardon him.

Bhāsa's concept of motherhood differs considerably from the popular Indian concept. He utilises Bharata for revealing his perception of the idea of motherhood. The general Indian concept is that mother is Supreme and is to be obeyed and respected in all contexts whatever may be her personal qualities. In the story of Paraśurāma though Paraśurāma slays the head of his mother, that action was not according to his desire but he was forced to do so by his father's command. But in Pratimānāṭaka Bharata declares that a mother forfeits the mother's claim by her treachery to her husband. भर्त्तृद्रोहास्तु माताप्यमाता (III-18) Hence Bharata does not consider Kaikeyī as his mother when he came to know the part played by his mother for causing illness and consequent death to Daśaratha. It is also evident from the statement:

मम मातुश्च मातुश्च मध्यस्था त्वं न शोभसे
गङ्गायमुनयोर्मध्ये कुनदीव प्रवेशिता।। (III-16)

So he does not offer respect to his mother Kaikeyī. By seeing Bharata is not offering his obeisance to his mother Kaikeyī, Kausalyā reminds him to do so. But Bharata declines and he firmly says she was my mother earlier and from now on she is not my mother. This is very clear from the lines (आसीत् पुरा, न त्विदानीम् (Act III)

Bharata's dictum that children need not consider one as their mother if she is not faithful to her husband

appears to be a quite divergent one and is contrary to the usual Indian tradition, culture and practice. However, it is to be admitted that from the psychological point of view of the children Bharata's concept appears to have validity.

A careful scrutiny of Pratimānāṭaka shows that Bharata is the most important character in this drama. Even the very name Pratimā according to Devadhar is becuse of the fact that Bharata is represented as the *pratimā* of Daśaratha and very similar to Rāma. This opinion of Devadhar, clearly shows that he too considers Bharata as the chief character in Pratimānāṭaka.

References

Bhaskaran. T.(ed) Bhāsanāṭakacakram, Tiruvanantapuram Malayala Granthavali. No.162, Oriental Research Institute & Manuscripts Library, 1987.

Devadhar. C.R (ed) Pratimānāṭaka with Introduction, translation and notes, Poona, 1930.

Ganapati Shastri. T. (ed) Pratimānāṭaka, TSS. No. 42 Trivandrum (1915)

Ganapati Shastri. T. Bhasa's plays - A Critical Study, Sridhara Power Press, Trivandrum 1925.

Menon K.P.A., Complete Plays of Bhasa (3 Vols) with English translation, Nag Publishers, Delhi. 1996.

Pusalkar A.D., Bhasa - A study, Munshiram Manoharlal, Oriental Publishers and Book Sellers, New Delhi 1968.

Unni N.P., Bhasa Afresh, Nag Publishers, New Delhi, 2000.

PRATIMANATAKA OF BHASA

Dr.G. Saradamma

Bhasa the great dramatist is known as the father of Indian Drama. Bhasa's dramas are the earliest available to us. In Malavikagnimitra Kalidasa refers to Bhasa thus-

प्रथितयशानांभाससौमिल्लकविपुत्रादीनांप्रबन्धान्
अतिक्रम्यवर्तमानकवेः कालिदासस्य क्रियायां कथं
परिषदोऽस्याः बहुमानः।

Thus among the three great dramatists, Bhasa is given the first place. Likewise Bana has paid very high tribute to Bhasa in his work Harshacarita

सूत्रधारकृतारम्भैः नाटकैः बहुभूमिकैः।
सपताकैर्यशोलेभेभासोदेवकुलैरिव।।

Rajasekhara and Abhinavagupta have quoted many verses from Bhasa's plays. Rajashekhara has mentioned that Swapnavasavadatta is the best work of Bhasa. He says:-

भासनाटकचक्रेऽस्मिन् छेकैः क्षिप्तेपरीक्षितुम्
स्वप्नवासवदत्तस्य दाहकोऽभून्नपावकः।।

Thus all the critics and poets of India highly honoured this great poet. About the personal history of Bhasa, we know very little. In the Bharatavakya of Swapna-vasavadatta he refers to one Rajasimha. Scholars are of

opinion that this Rajasimha was a title assumed by the Maurya King and Chandragupta Maurya in the 4th Century B.C had this title. As Bhasa has not followed the rules of Bharata, many scholars assign Bhasa to an early period. He described the death of the hero of the play Urubhanga on the stage, which is prohibited by Bharatamuni. The grammatical irregularities and the archaisms found in the works of Bhasa point to a date when the grammatical rules of panini had not been accepted. Like wise in the Pratimanataka Bhasa refers to the Arthasastra of Brihaspati and not the Arthasastra of Kautilya. This points to the fact that Bhasa must have lived at a time when the Arthasastra of Kautilya had not attained recognition and popularity. These facts help us to fix the date of Bhasa some where in the 4th Century B.C.

In Sanskrit, dramatic works are generally called *rūpakam* as they are to be seen when presented on the stage. There are ten major types नाटकं-प्रकरणं-भाणः-प्रहसनं डिमः--व्यायेगः-समवकारः-वीथि-अङ्क or उत्सृष्टिकाङ्कः and ईहामृगः। These types of *rupakas* differ from one another in the nature of plot, the hero and heroine, the main sentiment and the length of the play. Nataka and Prakarana must have a minimum of 5 acts and they are the most developed forms, Ḍima and Samavakāram must have 4 and 3 acts respectively. व्ययोगः-वीथि-भाणः-ईहामृगः and उत्सृष्टिकाङ्कः are one act plays while in प्रहसन there is no such restrictions. Vastu or plot Neta or Hero Rasa or

Sentiment, these three are the important constituents of a Rupakam. The plot may be historical (Prakhyata), legendary (Utpādyaḥ), fiction or (Misra). The hero may be a Dhīrodātta (magnanimous) dhīroddhata (violent) Dhīralalita (Graceful) or Dhīraśānta. The heroine may be (pious) Mugdha (shy) or Praudha (forward). There are nine sentiments Sriṅgāra (erotic),Vira (Heroic), Karuna (Pathetic), Raudra (Furious) Hasya (Humourous), Bhayanaka (Frightful) Bibhatsa (Loathsome) Adbhuta (Marvellous) and Santa (Quietism).

The plọt in a Nataka mụst be a well-knoṿn historical or traditional story and the hero should be a well-known king or a divine character. He must also be Udatta (brave), kind and generous. The theme must contain great deeds of heroism acquisition of wealth and prosperity and descriptions of sports and enjoyments. A Nataka should be divided into acts, interludes etc., and there must be at least 5 acts for the full development of the plot and sentiment. Every Sanskrit drama begins with a Nandi (prayer) and is followed by a Prastāvana or Sthāpana (prologue) which is conducted by Sutradhara or Stage Manager. The interludes called Praveshaka or Viṣkambhaka help to observe the continuity though the unity of time and place are not strictly observed. Any scene or character which is not directly connected with the development of the plot or sentiment is not allowed in a drama. The play ends with a Bharatavakyam which expresses a general wish of welfare of all.

The name Pratimanatakam is given by the Editor Mahā Mahopādhyāya. T.Ganapatisastri on the authority of colophon, at the end of the manuscript of the play अस्य नाटकस्य मातृकाग्रन्थान्तदृष्ट पाठानुसारात् प्रतिमानाटकमिति संज्ञा। The author has not mentioned the name anywhere in the Drama.

The name is an account of the importance of the pratima or statue in the statue house (Pratimagriha) on seeing which Bharata infers the tragic fate of Dasaratha after Sree Rama left him. The plot is drawn mainly from the Ayodhya and Āraṇya Kāṇḍas of the great epic Ramayana.

In the first act itself the foundation for the development of the dramatic plot has been laid. The crowning of Rama is the main theme. But there arises an impediment. At the time of marriage, Dasaradha has offered a brides price (Sulka) to Kaikeyi that the son born to Kaikeyi will succeed him as the king. At that time Dasaratha had no other issues. But now circumstances have changed. He wants to crown his eldest son Rama as his successor. But as the arrangements for the coronation are being made, Kaikeyi demands the Śulka. The effort of Dasaratha to crown Rama is the Bījam (seed of the great plot).

Kaikeyi's effort is the Arambha. Thus the first act represents the first stage in the development of the plot known as Mukhasandhi. Here we see Sita playfully

adorning herself with a *Valkala* and Rama's going to forest at the direction of his father, accompanied by Sita in bark garments, Lakshmana's anger towards Kaikeyi and Rama's appeasing words.

The second act depicts the mental state of the King Dasaratha affected by the separation from Rama. Here we see King Dasaratha lying in the summer palace, his heart shattered by the pangs of separation of his dear son. Hearing the news of the return of Sumantra after leaving Rama in the forest, Dasaratha falls unconscious. He has a vision of his departed ancestors and breathes his last.

The description of Dasaratha's plight,helps the development of the Karunarasa or Pathetic sentiment which has its beginning in the end of the first act. It continues as a subordinate Rasa till the middle of the Vth Act. *kāñcukīyo yavanikāstaraṇam karoti-* suggests the death of king Dasaratha on the stage, but it is not allowed by Bharatamuni.

In the third act Bharata learns of the death of his father when he sees his statue erected among the statues of his forefathers in the statue house. He falls unconscious and after his revival he accuses his mother and refuses to accept the coronation offered to him. Then he decides to go to the forest to see Rama.

The Bija which was in a dormant condition is revived in the IIIrd Act. Bhasa's efforts to achieve the final goal of Rama's coronation, begins here and

continues still the end of the 6th Act. Bharata is the *Patākānāyaka* hero of subsidiary plot. The sentiment of Dharmavira is further developed in this act and it represents the second stage of the *Pratimukhasandhi* and the beginning of the *Garbhasandhi,* the third stage.

In the IVth Act we see Bharata along with Sumantra coming to the hermitage of Rama. Bharata decides to remain in the forest and serve Rama, but he is convinced of his duty to fulfill the wishes of his father and he returns to Ayodhya with the sandals of Rama to place them on the throne and carry on the administration of the Kingdom, as their servant.

Bharata's meeting of Rama , and Rama's promise to return and accept the Kingdom at the end of 14 years in the forest, is the Prāptyāśa and definite stage in the development of the subsidiary plot-*patāka.* The words of Rama, Lakshmana, Sita and Bharata are suggestive of Dharmavira.

The Vth Act opens with the scene of Sita watering the plants of the hermitage in Janasthana. Rama is in a melancholy mood as he is unable to make worthy offerings to his departed ancestors in the Śrāddha of his father, which comes on the next day. Here Ravana enters in disguise of a *Sanyāsin* and refers to the Kāñcanapārśva deer in the peak of the Himalayas. Suddenly there appears a golden deer and Rama pursues it. Then the Sanyasin discloses his identity and carries away Sita by force.

Here Sita's abduction is an incident which is known as Prakari in the development of the plot.

In the VI[th] act Jatayu is killed and Sumantra discloses the news of the abduction of Sita by Ravana. Bharata goes to Kaikeyi, the root cause of all these calamities and now Kaikeyi disclosed her motive in sending Rama to the forest-the curse of a sage to Dasaratha to die of Putraśōka.

She also tells that she wanted to say only 14 Days, but in her confusion she unwillingly said 14 years. These things were known to Vasiṣṭha and Vamadeva and had their approval. Bharata begging her pardon for all that he said and did decides to march with a big army to help Rama and fight against Ravana.

In importance, this VIth Act is next to the 3[rd] Act, since the motive of Kaikeyi in sending Rama to the forest, which is kept a secret,is disclosed here. All the obstacles in the way of Bharata's efforts to the coronation are cleared. This act represents the end of Vimarśasandhi.

The VII[th] Act describes Rama's return to Ayodhya, after killing Ravana. Sita, whose purity is testified by Gods and divine sages, is greeted and surrounded by ascetic women. In the Janasthana itself the first coronation of Rama, takes place in the presence of his brothers, preceptors like Vasistha and Vamadeva and the Queen mothers amidst the cries of victory. Then they all get into the Pushpakavimana and go to Ayodhya.

In this act the efforts of Bharata and Kaikeyi all are concluded happily. The sentiment of Dharmavira is fully developed. Every one is happy and having discharged his or her duty and this act represents the Nirvahanasandhi.

In Pratimānāṭaka, the Rasa is Dharmavira mingled with Karuṇa. The Dharmavīra is displayed by Rama in fulfilling the mandates of his father.

The hero of Pratimānātaka. Rama is a Hero of Dhirodatta type. He is calm and dignified in prosperity and adversity. He is magnanimous even to Kaikeyi and finds justification of her demand of the śukla सत्यसन्धः विमत्सरः जगत्प्रियः गुरुशुश्रूषणेयुक्त these are the chief characteristics of Rama's character. He is सकलजन-हृदयहारिरामः and is the beloved of the whole world जगप्रियः. He accepts the coronation only when Dasarata compels him. After the death of his father, he does not return to Ayodhya till the 14 years of exile is completed. When Bharata insists on staying with him in the forest, he reminds him of his father's words and his duty to carry out it - नृपतेर्वचनं तदनृतं कर्तुं न युक्तं त्वया. Rama gives highest consideration to Truth. He says to Bharata कुलं च नः सत्यधनम्. Rama is *Jitakrodha* and *Vimatsara* when he hears the coronation is suddenly stopped, he is not angry with Dasarath or Kaikeyi. He is happy to see that he is free from the burden of governing the country. He pacifies Lakshmana with sound reasoning. When

Lakshmana reports that Rama is exiled from his country he takes it as an opportunity to perform his duty, which others have not done - करोम्यन्यैर्नृपैः धर्म नैवाप्तं नोपपादितम्।

Even his enemy Ravana is attracted by the striking personality of Rama. He says रामइत्यक्षरैरल्पैः स्थाने व्याप्तमिदं जगत्। In this drama Bhasa has portrayed Rama's pursuing the golden deer for Sraddha and not for the fancy of his wife. Thus in many ways Rama is sketched as a Dhīrodātta type of hero.

The soliloquy and conversation in the Nataka have got life-like reality. Some of the materials of Pratimanataka are later adopted by Kalidasa in his Shakuntala. For e.g:, In Pratimanataka Bhasa says सौवर्णमिव वल्कलं सम्वृत्तम् In Shakuntala Kalidasa says किमिव हि मधुराणां मण्डनं नाकृतीनाम्। (Act I,17)

Likewise the penance of watering plants described in the Pratimanataka (Act V, v. 3)

योऽस्याःकरः श्राम्यति दर्पणेऽपि

स नैति खेदं कलशंवहन्त्याः।

कष्टं वनं स्त्रीजनसौकुमार्यम्

समं लताभिः कठिनीकरोति।।

Resembles the unbearableness expressed in the following stanza of Sakauntala (Act I, v - 16)

इदंकिलाव्याजमनोहरं वपुः

तपक्षमंसधयितुं इच्चति।

ध्रुवं स नीलोत्पलपत्राधारया

समिल्लतांछेत्तुंऋषिर्व्यवस्यति ।।

These resemblance in the work of Kalidasa, is a clue to find out,how much Bhasa has influenced great poets like Kalidasa.

In this work Bhasa has avoided any reference to the two boons of the epic and here *śulka* is the reason for Kaikeyi's demand of the Kingdom for Bharata. This makes her motive pure and noble. In the Ramayana, Kaikeyi is a cruel and avaricious woman. In this Nataka the curse of the sage on Dasaratha is the cause of sending Rama to the forest. Though the *śāpa* and *śulka* are mentioned in Ramayana in different contexts, here Bhasa put these in the place of two boons. Like wise the *Valkala* scene also makes very good result. It is an irony that the *Valkala* put on by Rama and Sita become their regular dress in the forest life. By inventing the statue scene, Bhasa represents Kaikeyi as a noble lady. Bhasa saves Kaikeyi from telling the cruel truth to Bharata herself. If Bharata had been allowed to enter Ayodhya and meet Vasiṣṭha and others it would have been difficult to guard the secret. Thus the statue scene has very important part in the development of the plot.

In Ramayana the meeting of Rama and Bharata takes place in the Citrakūṭa hill. But Bhasa makes the *Ramatapovana* or *Rāmāśrama* in the *Janasthāna* their meeting place, from where Sita was abducted by Ravana.

Likewise in the Epic Bharata goes to Nandigrāma but Bhasa's Bharata goes to Ayodhya.

In the Ramayana, Lakshmana is being abused by Sita in the absence of Rama. But Bhasa brings the absence of Lakshmana under the pretext of receiving the Kulapati. Likewise Bhasa's Rama pursues the golden deer to offer the animal *Śraddha* of his father not to satisfy the childish whim of Sita. Thus the great poet Bhasa has made his work Pratimanataka a monument to his fame.

BHĀSA ON CERTAIN ASPECTS OF LIFE

Dr. K.S. Lalithambal

Among the thirteen Trivandrum Plays the authorship of which has been ascribed to Bhasa; six of them are based on Mahābhāratha, two on Ramāyaṇa and five on popular legends.

Bhasa dwells upon the different aspects of life in his dramas. His deep insight into human mind is clearly discernable in his dramas. He endeavours to uphold moral values through portrayal of his characters. He tries to enlighten his readers by giving good pieces of advices.

Among his works, Svapnavāsavadatta is undoubtedly the best and most mature product of Bhasa's genius. Bhasa's profound psychological insight is seen in almost all the events in his drama. At the outset of the play Yougandharayaṇa disguises as a Brahmin Mendicant and Vāsavadatta as a young Brahmin woman come to the hermitage. The servants escorting Padmavati cry out ordering the people to clear the path. Vāsavadatta feels humiliated on hearing the command of servants. She feels sorry that she is reduced to such a pathetic condition Vāsavadatta's question whether she too may be asked to give way to the princess is quite natural from a queen in disguise and reply *'anirjnātāni daīvatāni avadhūyante'* that even Gods are insulted when not

recogonised' shows clear insight into the working of human mind. Yaugandharayaṇa means that Vāsavadatta has to put up with this humiliation, because her true identity is not known now and the servants may take her only as an ordinary woman. Bhasa tries to drive home the idea that one should get himself adjusted to new circumstances. So also at the first sight of the princess Padmavathy, Yaugandharāyaṇa feels so much attachment to her and he points out the reason.

> Pradveṣo bahumāno vā sañkalpādupa jāyate /
>
> bhartṛdārābhilāṣitvādasyām me mahatisvatā //

One likes or dislikes a person or thing not because the person or things are good or bad but because of his own pre-conceived notion about the person or thing. When one wants to make use of things for his own benefit, he begins to like it. Yougandharāyaṇa tries to make Padmavathy, the wife of his master order to get Darsaka's help to destroy the enemy Aruni and hence he feels greatly drawn towards her. This is a beautiful verse which expresses a profound truth about the working of the human mind in a crisp and simple style.

The portrayal of the character of Karṇa in Karṇabhāra reveals Bhasa's dramatic skills and psychological insight. The verse:

> pūrvam kuntyām samutpannaḥ rādheya iti viśrutaḥ
>
> yudhiṣhtirādayaste me yavīyāmsastu pāṇḍavāḥ

is worthy of mention. Karna is worried about his mother Kunti's request and the curse of his preceptor Paraśurāma. The recently known truth that the Pandavas, whom he up to that time regarded as his worst enemies, are really his younger brothers cause mental agony. Karṇa further recollects in his mind the request of Kuṇti not to kill her sons and the curse of his preceptor Parasurāma making his missile futile at the most critical moment. These thoughts are enough to depress any human beings even if he is hard - hearted. Even though struck with grief Karna makes his mind ready for the battle and proceeds towards the battle filed with a firm resolve to defeat Arjuna. By this Bhasa tries to enlighten the people that even while facing adverse circumstances one should be brave enough to withstand the miseries and step towards the goal hoping for the good results to come.

Bharata's mental anguish is very beautifully described in the Pratimānātaka. The news of Dasaratha's death is very clearly and dramatically conveyed to Bharata through the statue house. Bharata is not actually informed the death of his father when he is brought to Ayodhya by the charioteer. Before his entering the city of Ayodhya Bharata is led to a hall of statues. Among the statues of Dilipa, Raghu and Aja, he happened to see the statues of his father Dasaratha. The enquiry made by Bharata as to whether statues are ever made of living monarchs is very touching. Bhasa's knowledge of the

working of the human mind is very clear in the emotions portrayed by Bharata at this juncture. The negative replay to his question shook Bharata like a thunderbolt and he fell prostrate on the ground. Here we find that Bhasa put forth the new idea as to how bad news can be conveyed to others gradually without giving much mental shock to them all on a sudden.

It is very clear that Bhasa upholds moral values. His work Karṇabhāra is meant to impress the minds of the audience on the importance of generosity. Likewise in order to drive home the ideal of generosity into the human mind, he has selected as the hero of the play Carudattam a character by name Carudatta who had been very rich and later reduced to poverty on account of his generosity. Karna's words that everything else (even good learning, firmly rooted trees and fountains of water get dried up but sacrifices and charities live to the end is firmly expressed in the verse.

śikṣā kṣayamgachati kālaparyayāt

subaddhamūlāḥ nipatanti pādapāḥ

jalam jalasthānagatamca śuṣyati

hutam ca dattam ca ta thaiva tiṣṭhati

So also towards the end of the play Sakra after receiving the armor and ear rings of Karna sends through his messenger an unfailing weapon, a spear called Vimala to kill one among the sons of Pandus. Karna's

replay to the messenger of Sakra *'dattasya na pratigṛhṇāmi'* is worthy of mention, meaning I do not receive anything in return to what I have given. Bhasa tries to uphold the idea that one should not expect the reward for the help done to others is beautifully described by Karṇa in the verse.

dharmo hi yatnaiḥ puruṣena sādhyaḥ
bhujaṅgarihvā, capalā nṛpaśriyaḥ/
tasmāt prajāpālanamātrabudhyā
hateṣu deheṣu guṇāḥ dharante//

Virtue alone is to be acquired by man with effort. Royal fortunes are fickle like a serpent's tongue. Therefore, with the only idea of protecting the subjects, one should live and work, so that when bodies are killed virtues survive, fame acquired by meritorious deeds lives long after the body has perished. This is a noble idea that has motivated many great men to sacrifice their lives for doing good to people. His Dutaghaṭotkaca is meant to impress the virtues of heroism and ultimate faith in god the omnipotence of Lord Krishna. His verse in Dūtavākya.

rājyam nāma nṛpātmajaiḥ sahṛdayairjitvā ripūn bhujyate
talloke na tu yācyate na tu punardīnāya vā dīyate/

throws light on the heroic spirit and valour of the Kings. It conveys the idea that a kingdom is not won begging but only by fighting for it.

kāṅkṣā eennṛ patitvamāptumacirāt kurvantu te sāhasam

svairam vā praviśantu

śāntamatibhirjuṣṭam śamāyāśramam// (24)

According to ethics, prominence is given to mother, father, preceptor and God respectively. The Madhyamavyayoga is meant to impress on the audience the importance of *mātṟbhakti*, and also make them aware of the principles of self-sacrifice and self effacement. That the mother's order is to be implicitly obeyed irrespective of the consequence is illustrated by Ghaṭotkaca who feels no hesitation in harassing the Brahmins though deserved to be honoured. His remark:

jānāmi sarvatra sadā ca nāma

dvijottamāḥ pūjyatamāḥ pṟthivyām

akāryametacca mayādya kāryam

māturniyo gādapanīya saṅkām.// (9)

I have to do this improper act today without hesitation, owing to the command of my mother deserves mention. It is also suggested that in a conflict between the orders of one's parents the order proceeding from one's mother outweigh that of the father. The ideata of self-sacrifice is beautifully expressed in the speeches of the Brahmins and his sons. Bhima also expressed the same idea:

mātā kila manuṣyāṇām daivatānām ca daivatam /

māturājñām puraskṛtya vayametām daśām gatāḥ// (37)

for men mother is verily the deity of deities. It is on account of the obeisance to our mother's command, that we have ourselves come to this state.

The superiority of Bhasa as one who upholds morals is very clear in the portrayal of the characters in Svapnavasavadatta. In this play Vāsavadatta, the wife of Udayana is portrayed as an ideal wife. She is prepared to undergo any amount of suffering and humiliation for the good of her husband. She agrees to live in separation and works for the marriage of her husband with another woman and even wreathe the wedding garland for Padmavathy. The second wife of Udayana is also portrayed as a beautiful woman endowed with good virtues. She is not at all jealous and has got an open mind to understand the feelings of her husband. She only appreciates the King for remembering the virtues of his former wife Vāsavadatta. In Cārudattam also the wife of Carudatta is portrayed as an ideal wife. When she came to know that the ornaments entrusted to her husband by Vasantasena are stolen, she is becomes unhappy and decides to hand over his valuable pearl necklace. In Urubhanga, Bhasa has portrayed the character of Duryodhana in such a way that he can be referred of as an ideal hero. He repents for the wrong deeds done by him to the Pandavas. By this be tries to bring out the idea that all hostilities will perish at the time of death.

Bhasa's knowledge of worldly affairs is seen in all his plays. He wishes to throw light on the sufferings caused by poverty to the hero of the play Cārudatta. The words of Cārudatta.

"dāridryam khalu nāma manasvinaḥ puruṣasya socchvāsam maraṇam"

Poverty is indeed a veritable death of the high - minded with breathing. He also tries to make his audience the general nature of the people towards a poor man.

dāridryāt puruṣasya bāndhavajano vākye na santiṣṭate

sattvam hāsyamupaiti śīlaśaśinaḥ kāntiḥ parimlāyate

nirvairā vimukhībhavanti suhrdaḥ sphītā

bhavantyāpadaḥ

pāpam karma ca yat parairapi kṟtam tattasya

sambhāvyate//

When a man turns poor his relatives no more care for his words. Even though possessed of good qualities, his virtues are not appreciated. His friends depart and troubles mulitply. Moreover he will be held responsible for the evils committed by others. The verse:

kaḥ śradhāsyati bhūtārtham sarvo mām parisankati
Saṅkanīyā hi doṣeṣu nisprabhāva daridratā.

also conveys the same idea - 'Who will indeed care for the truth? Everyone will suspect me. Helpless poverty is always prone to all suspicions in crimes. According to

Bhasa more pitiable is the state of a man who has lost his wealth by his misfortune and pitied by a woman by giving him money. The idea is beautifully expressed in the verse.

mayi dravyakṣayakṣīne strīdravyenānukampitaiḥ
arthataḥ puruṣo nārī yā nāri yā nārī sārthataḥ
pumān

In such a condition he becomes a woman (through the absense of wealth) and a woman becomes a man (through possession of welth).

In Svapnavasavadatta Bhasa draws our attention towards the fickleness of worldly pleasures and fortunes. Yougandharayana's word to pacify Vasavadatta deserve mention. Formerly while living with your husband you have moved like this escorted by servants and attendants and maids according to your own desire. Again after the victory of your husband you will move in luxury. The present plight is only a passing phase in your life about which you should not brood too much. Yaugandharayana substantiates what he said above by pointing out a common law of nature:

kālakrameṇa jagataḥ parivartamānā
cakrārapaṅtiriva gacchati bhāgyapaṅktih//

Fortune is never steady it moves up and down like the spokes of a wheel.

Bhasa also tries to instruct the people as to how hey should face the worldly sorrows and sufferings of the world. His words *āgamapradhanāru sulabhaparya vasthānāni mahāpuruṣahṛdayāni'* deserve mention here. These words are utterred by Yougandharayana to pacify Padmavathy. The hearts of great men are guided by sacred scriptures and hence can be easily restored.

Thus it can be pointed out that the dramas of Bhasa had definite purpose i.e. to enlighten his reader and give him courage to face the miseries of the world.

AN INTRODUCTION TO BHASA'S CHARACTERS

M. Muraleedharan Nair

Though *Kalidasa* had praised *Bhasa* as a master of the art of dramatic compositions, none of his work had been available until the great Sanskrit Scholar Sri.T. Ganapathy Sastri had found out ten plays namely, (1) *swapna vāsavadattam,* (2) *pratinjā yougandharāyaṇam,* (3) *ūrubhangam,* (4) *karṇa bhāram,* (5) *avimārakam,* (6) *bālacaritam,* (7) *dūta ghatotkacam,* (8) *panca rātram,* (9*) madhyama vyāyogam,* (10) *cārudattam*. Other two works namely *abiseka* and *pratima* were found out from Kaduthuruthy and the manuscript of *dūta vākyam* was found from the palace collections

Sri. Ganapathy Sastri had substantiated from inner evidences that the same author wrote all these thirteen plays and that it was none other than *Bhasa.*

We know little about *Bhasa.* We don't know whether his real name was *Bhasa* or when and where he lived. But we have all these thirteen plays before us. In all these works the simple effective dramatic skill is evident in every respect.

"*Nātakāntam kavitvam*" is a wellknown phrase in Sanskrit, which means, "the touch stone of a poet's genius is evident in his dramatic composition". These dramas of *Bhasa* prove his metal.

STAGE EFFECT OF BHASA'S PLAYS:-

Bhasa's dramas are written for stage presentation. Even today they can be presented on stage without any alteration or modification. Whether it is conflict of ideas or conflict of emotions, every act is filled with actions to be performed by talented actors on the stage. This cannot be said of even *Kalidasa's* dramas. The main characteristics of his works are their brevity and simplicity. Dialogues are brief and accurate. Let me give one example from *Pratijna Yougandharāyaṇam.*

Kāñcukīyah - *tatra bhavatā amātyena śālaṅkāyanena gṛhīto vatsarājaḥ।*

Rājā (saharṣam) - *Kimāha bhavān ?*

Kāñcukīyah - *tatra bhavatā amātyena śālaṅkāyanena gṛhīto vatsarājaḥ।*

Rājā - *Udayanaḥ ?*

Kāñcu - *Adha kim ?*

Rājā - *Śatānīkasya putraḥ ।*

Kāñcu - *Dṛḍham.*

Rāja - *Sahasrānīkasya naptā ।*

Kāñcu - *Sa eva!*

Rāja - *Kauśāmbīśāḥ*

Kāñcu - *Suvyaktam*

Rāja - *Gandharva vittakaḥ।*

Kāñcu - *Evam bruvanti।*

Rājā - *Vatsarajo nanu ।*

Kāñcu - *Atha kim Vatsa rajah।*

Raja - *Adha kimuparato yaugandharayaṇaḥ ?*

Kāñcu - *Na khalu, kauśāmbyām kila* ।

Raja - *Yadyevam na gṛhīto vatsarājaḥ* ।

BHASA'S WORKS:-

Among the thirteen *Bhasa* plays seven are full-fledged dramas while six of them are one act plays. *Pratiñja Yougandharayanaṃ* And *Svapna Vasavadattam* tell the famous *Udayana-Vasavadatta* story. In the *Pratinja Yougandharayanam Udayana,* the real hero of the story never appears on the stage but his presence is felt throughout the play. This is a clean example of Bhasa's dramatic genius. The role-played by *Yaugandharayana* and *Rumanvan*, the two ministers and *Vasantaka*, the jester, provide plenty of opportunities for talented actors to perform them on the stage. *Bhasa's* wit and humour find place in many occasions in this drama. *Svapnavasavadattanm.*

Many scholars hold the view that *Svapnavāsava-dattam* is the master piece of *Bhasa*. Even before the discovery of the *Bhasa's* plays the authorship of *Svapnavāsavadattam* was attributed to *Bhasa*. The drama deals with the second part of the *Udayana* story. The very name given to the drama might have influenced *Kalidasa* in naming his work "*Abhinjāna śākuntalam*". Many of *Bhasa's* expressions find place in *Kalidasa's* works. "*Nīcairgacchatyupari ca dasa cakranemikrameṇa*" (Megha dūtam). Compare these lines with "*cakrāra-paṅktiriva gacchati bhāgyapaṅtiḥ*" *(Svapnavasavadattam)*. "*Kimivahi madhurāṇām maṇḍanam nākṛtīnām*"

(Śākuntalam) is the refined form of *Bhaṭṭini, sarva śobhanīyam surūpam nāma (Pratima nāṭakam).* The fifth act of *Svapnavāsavadattam* namely the *svapnadarśanāṅkam* is most touching.

Cārudattam

This work is incomplete. In this drama the hero *Cārudatta* is a merchant youth and heroine a courtesan called *Vasantasena. Vasantasena* had really fallen in love with *Cārudatta* who had lost all his wealth due to his charity.

Pratimānāṭakam

Bharata, Rama's younger brother was returning from *Kekaya* to *Ayodhya.* On his way he rests in a temple where the statues of past kings of the *Raghu* dynasty were installed. Suddenly he was stunned by seeing the statue of his own father, King *Daśaratha*. He asked "*Sumantra*" whether the statues of living kings are installed. The answer was in the negative. The fact that his father was dead rushes to *Bharata's* mind and he faints. Here again *Bhasa's* dramatic genius finds new idea of the installation of statues for effective suggestion. Hence the drama is named *Pratimanatakam.*

Abhiṣeka nāṭakam

Abiṣekanāṭakam tells the story of two coronations made by *Rama. Rama's* commanding power prevails supreme in the drama. In the beginning *Bali* is killed by *Rama* for the sake of *Sugrīva* according to the treaty

made between them. *Sugīiva* challenges his elder brother *Bali* for a dual. On his challenge, king *Bali* enters the scene saying thus *"Adyāham sugrīvam bhagnagrīvam kariṣyāmi"*. When *Rama* fells him *Bali* asks *Rama*, "why did you do this to me?". *Rama's* answer was that *Bali* did deserve punishment. "You have taken your brother's wife by force, so you are punished". *Bali* says that he has no answer for this-"*hanta anuttara vayam*". In the second part of the work *Rama* makes *Vibhisana* the king of *Lanka* after killing *Ravana.*

Avimarakam

Avimarakam is a love story in which the love affairs of *Avimaraka* and *Kuraṅgī* are depicted. In this drama "*Śringāra*" and "*Aścarya*" are suggested beautifully.

Madhyamavyāyogam

Madhyamavyāyogam is a one-act play. The "*Madhyama*" or "the middle one" among the *Pandavas* i.e., *Bhimasena* was to meet his son *Khatotkaca* as a result of a dramatic situation organised by *Hidimba*, his beloved. *Hidimba* wanted to bring the father and son face to face. For this purpose she arranges a plan. She deploys her son to capture a Brahmin and his family who had been passing by the jungle path. At the call of the word "*Madhyamā*", *Bhimasena* comes to the scene. The father and son meet together and the story ends in a beautiful comedy of family reunion. Written in elegant style, this one act play is very effective for stage presentation.

Dūtavākyam

Dūtavākyam narrates the episode of *Vasudeva Krishna* appearing as a messenger of *Pandavas. Duryodhana* wants to tie up *Keśava*, the cowboy. Suddenly the scene changes and *Duryodhana* becomes helpless before the personality of *Krishna*. Here *Bhasa* presents personified characters like *Sankha, Chakra, Gada*, etc. This drama can be staged for children.

Dūtaghaṭotkacam

Here *Ghaṭōtkaca* enters as a messenger of *Krishna*. The message was for *Dhṛtarāṣṭra. Ghatotkaca* tells his grandfather that if he had any wish or last desire, he should fulfill it, for the end of *Kuruvamśa* is fast approaching.

Karṇabhāram

This one act play is a tragedy by *Bhasa*. On the way to the warfront, *Karna* narrates the episode of the curse that he had received from his *Guru Parasurama*. The listener is his charioteer *Salya.*

Ūrubhaṅgam

In *ūrubhaṅgam,* the tragic end of king *Duryodhana* is described, though the work may not be a tragedy in the true sense; the inner conflict of the dying king is depicted in a touching way. The hero *Duryodhana* is the embodiment of valour. He is the prestigious king of *Bharatavarsa*. He never repents on any of his deeds. He has his own justification for his actions.

An evaluation

If dramatic works are art of scenes, *Bhasa's* works are best examples of dramas. *"Avasthānukṛtirnāṭyam rūpam dṛśyatayocyate rūpakam tatsamāropāt"* so says *Dhananjaya* in his *Dasarupaka*. One may think that these definitions are made after seeing the *rupakas* of *Bhasa*. For *Bhasa* has experienced almost all forms of *rūpakas*, from one-act plays to full-fledged dramas.

The source of his works is distinct from any other dramatists in Sanskrit. The relation between Bhimasena *and* Hidimba- *the theme of* Dūtaghaṭotkacam, *the depiction of the last moments of king Duryodhana* in Ūrubhaṅgam, *the inner agony of the hero Karna caused by his own people etc., are examples. From his viewpoint,* Hidimba *is a loving mother, an intelligent wife and a nice gentlewoman who silently waits for the reunion of her husband. She gives a strong and charming son to her husband when he needs him most at his side. He proudly remarks "Bho Suyodhanah kṛtarakṣo bhava, vardhate te satrupaksa". He remembers her company thus:-*

"Asmākam bhraṣṭarājyanam bhramatana gahane vane

jatakarunyaya devi santaponasitastvaya."

To our poet, king *Duryodhana* is not a treacherous king but a hero who stands upright with his bravery and valour. Even "*Krishna*" is sidelined in his presence in

Ūrubhaṅgam. Acarya Balarama has all the compassion for his disciple.

The great dramatist tells the story of earthly people of flesh and blood; at the same time he proves his ability in depicting all major sentiments. How can we limit the sentiment of *Svapnavasavadattam* to mere Sringara?. It is more than that. In *Avimarakam Āścarya* and *Sringara* go hand in hand. *Bhasa* has the unique ability in dealing *Hasya rasa* with all its colourfulness. The scenes and dialogues of *Pratinja-Yaugandharayanam* can be mentioned in this context.

Bhasa's characters

"*Sūtradhāra kṛtārambhiaḥ nāṭakaiḥ*
bahubhūmikaiḥ/
Sapatakāir yaśo lebhe bhāso devakulairiva".

A vivid presentation of diverse characters can be seen in *Bhasa's* works. Each one is worthy of study as every one has a purpose to serve in the drama. Here we review a few of *Bhasa's* characters.

***King Duryodhana* of Ūrubhangam;-**

Of all the characters of the *Mahabharatam* the personality of *Duryodhana* attracts *Bhasa* the most. He has drawn all dimensions of this character with admiration. *Bhasa* admires his bravery, valour and grace. *Duryodhana* appears in four of *Bhasa's* plays. In *Dūtavākyam* he is presented as an arrogant immature prince. He is adventurous but at the same time he fails to

measure the strength of his "unwelcome guest" *Kesava*, who appears as a messenger of *Pandavas.* He underestimates him. His adventurous nature is depicted in *Pañcarātram* as well. But in *Dūtavakyam* he appears to be a mature king, who could justify his stand on sound reasons.

"Dūtaḥ khalu bhavān prāpto na tvam
yuddhārthamāgataḥ /
Gṛhītvā gacha sandeśam na vayam dūtaghātakāh". //

But in *Ūrubhangam,* king *Duryodhana* subdues all other characters. Here *Bhasa* portraits him in his natural colour. His parents are proud of their brave son. "Are you tired my son?" the mother asks. "*bhavatyāḥ khalvaham putraḥ"* was the answer. *Gandhari* was proud of her son. She remarks:- "*Mahārāja, ahamabhitaputrapradāyinī*". *Duryodhana* pacifies his father thus:- "*Aparāṅgmukho yudhi hata iti bhostāta, śokanigraheṇa kriyatām mamānugrahaḥ"*.

KARNAH:-

In *Karṇabharam, Karna* alone is focused. This one act play is a tragedy by *Bhasa. Karna*, the hero talks to *Salya*, his charioteer to the warfront. He is perhaps the most tragic character that *Bhasa* had presented on stage. He was deceived by his own mother, cursed by his "Guru", cheated by his opponent's father in disguise and insulted by all the elders of the *Kuru* family. Now he is

going to meet his arch rival *Arjuna,* not to kill him but to be killed by him! He says;-

"Akṣayostu gobrāhmaṇānām. Akṣayostu pativratānām. Akṣayostu raṇesvaparāṅmukhānām youdha puruṣāṇām. Akṣayostu mama prāptakalsaya. Eṣa bho, prasannosmi".

Bhimasenah

In *Madhyamavyāyoga, Bhimasena* is presented as a loving husband and an affectionate father. Apart from the politics and warfare here we see the cool sentiments of family reunion. *Bhimasena* meets *Hiḍimba* once again. He remarks:-

"Asmākam bhraṣṭarājyānām bhramatām gahane vane

Jatakarunyaya devi, santāpo nasitastvaya".

Ghaṭotkacah

Khatotkacah is a shining jewel among *Bhasa's* characters. This character is almost an insignificant one in the "*Itihasa*", but in *Bhasa's* plays he assumes the status of a bright star, which shines perhaps even brighter than "*Abhimanyu*" of the *Mahābhāratam.* In *Dūtaghatotkacam* and *Madhyamavyāyoga* he steels the heart of every one on the stage and off the stage.

Heroines

Bhasa's women characters represent all the good qualities of Indian womanhood. For them love is a sacred penance. They are ready to face hardship to any extent

for the welfare of their husbands. Whether it is "*Vāsavadattā*" or "*Vāsantasenā*", "*Hiḍimbā*" or "*Gāndhārī*", though different in character they are strong support to their husbands and they inspire them the most. *Bhīmasena* of *Madhyamavyayoga* stands like a child before *Hiḍimbā.* His child like question- "*Devi, kimidam*" gets the answer- "*Aryaputra, evamidam*"!!

MINOR CHARACTERS

Some of *Bhasa's* characters are good listeners who serve the purpose of projecting the heros in the limelight. *Salya* of *Karnabhāram, Balarama* of *Ūrubhaṅgam, Sumantra* of *PRATIMA* are a few examples. Even the *Brahmacāri* of *Svapnavasavadattam* and *Durjaya* of *ūrubhangam* steel our heart.

To *Bhasa Aśvatthāma* is not the embodiment of vengeance but on the other hand he is a true *Brahmin* fighter who stands for justice. No wonder

"***Sa patākair yaśō lebhe bhāso devakulairiva***"

SENTIMENT IN THE DRAMAS OF BHĀSA

Jaganadh.G

1.0 Introduction

Sentiment is considered as the soul of a poetic composition. Bharata, the great dramatist considered *rasa* as the most important among the elevan ingredients in a drama. He has considered *rasa* as the prominent among the eleven ingredients of a drama.

Rasābhāvāhyabhinayāḥ dharmīvṛttipṛavṛttayaḥ /

Siddhisvarāstathātodyamgānam raṅgaścasaṅgrahaḥ //[1]

No ingredient will function in drama if it is drift of sentiment. This great dictum was first put forward by Bharata in his introduction to Rasasutra followed by his famous *Rasasūtra*.

Nahi rasādṛte kaścidarthaḥ pravartate

tatravibhāvānubhāvavyabhicārisamyōgādrasaniṣpattiḥ/[2]

This *rasasūtra,* consisting of words in the succinct aphorism epitomises the mode of relish not only of a drama but a spectacular form of fine art in general. Bharatas aphorism is as important as a *mahāvākya* in the *Vēdanta* Philosophy, while the former stands as the testimony to the union of the aesthete and the

---

[1] Natyasastra,Bharata,Acarya.N.S.Madhusudana saraswati (Ed),Banaras Hindu University,Varanasi,1975.p.601.

[2] *Ibid,* p. 620.

rasabrahama, the universal principle of *rasa*, the latter *mahāvākya* in the *advaita* relates the oneness of the individual soul and the supreme soul. Bharatas aphorism interpreting the mode of delight of a spectacular art form is not modified or questioned by any one till date. The validity of this aphorism has been whole heartedly accepted and approved by all the rhetoricians. His aphorism covers all types of sentiment in all genre of dramatic compositions. According to him the nine *sthāyibhāvas* may develop into the corresponding sentiment in a favorable situation. Of the nine sentiments one will be interpreted as the main sentiment supported by other subsidiaries. The main sentiment in a poetic composition is determined by the dominant mental mood of the main character. As a result the name of a dramatic composition should conceive the main sentiment in it.

1. I. Bhasa and 13 Trivandrum Plays

Bhasa was the first dramatist in the entire history of Sanskrit literature. He flourished in the 6^{th} C B.C[2].His date is a subject under academic dispute. For a long time Scholars considered that the Dramas of Bhasa were lost for ever. It was in the year 1910 Late Mahamaho-padhyaya. T.Ganapati Satri had discovered 13 plays bearing the mark of the authorship of Bhasa. Dūtavākya, Kaṛṇabhāra, Dūtaghatōtkaca, Ūrubhanga, Madhya-

---

[2] Krishnamachariar, History of Classical Sanskrit Literature ,Motilal Banarasidass,Varanasi,1974, p.553.

mavyāyōga, Pañcarātra, Abhiṣēkanāṭaka, Bālacarita, Pratimānataka, Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, Svapnavāsavadatta, Avimāraka and Cārudatta are the Thirteen Plays discovered by M.M. T.Ganapati Sāstri and ascribed to the authorship of Bhasa.

2.0. Sentiment In The Dramas Of Bhasa

The names of the drama of Bhasa also carry the essence of their central theme. Each and every dramas of Bhasa interprets a main sentiment supported by subsidiary ones. This aspect of the delight of the dramas of Bhasa is referred to by Jayadeva in his Prasannarāghava.

Bhāsō hāsaḥ kavikulagurukāḷidāsō vilāsaḥ /[2]

Here the dictum *Bhāsō hāsah* may mean that the dramas of Bhasa are delightful. This aspect of relish is primarily aimed at from a drama to quote- *ānandanisyandisu rupakeṣu vyutpattimātraṃphala malpabuddhiḥ* /[3]

The present paper analyses the treatment of sentiment in the following dramas of Bhāsa. Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa, Svapnavāsavadatta, Bālacarita, Madhyamavyāyōga, Dūtavākya, Cārudatta, Karṇabhāra and Ūrubhanga. The last two dramas mentioned here viz. Karnabhāra and Urubhanga are specially noted for their sentiment of pathos (*karuṇa*).

---

[2] Jayadeva,Prasannaraghava.I.22.
[3] Dasarupaka,Sudhakar Malviya (Ed),Chowkhamba,Varanasi,1979, p.5.

2. I. Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa

Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa is a nātaka in four acts that deals with a political theme. Vīra is the dominant sentiment in the drama. But Bhasa skillfully employed the sentiment of *hāsya* to make the drama enjoyable. The abduction of king Udayana by king Pradyota and Yougandharayanas attempt to rescue Udayana is the central theme of the play. Yaugandharayana (the minister of Udayana) became successful in his mission. The sentiment of valour (*vira*) is reflected in the character of Yaugandharayana. Humorous elements in this drama are not mechanical.

2. II. Svapnavāsavadatta

Svapnavāsavadatta is a continuation of Pratijñā-yaugandha -rāyaṇa having six acts. The theme of the play is political. The main sentiment of the drama is *viyōgasringāra,* a sub-category of *sringāra* , supported by pathos.

In *viyōgasringāra* the heroine and hero are separated each other. In Svapnavasavādatta the cause of *viyōga* is entirely different from other dramas. The separation of the hero and the heroine is artificial. Only the heroine knows the fact about the separation. The separation between Uadyana and Vāsavadatta is a political trick played by Yaugandharāyana. The separation of the hero and the heroine is for a short

while. As the feeling of separation (*viyōgatva)* exits there. The dominant sentiment in the drama is viyōgasringāra.

2. III. Bālacarita.

Bālacarita is a beautiful drama describing the birth of Krisna and his miraculous performance up to the coronation of Ugrasēna. Vīra is the dominant sentiment of the drama and it is supported by other sentiments like adbhuta, karuna, roudra and bhayānaka.

2. IV. Madhyamavyāyōga

Madhyamavyāyōga is a vyāyōga type of drama in one act. The central theme of the play is taken from Mahābhārata. In the drama Bhīma the madhyama among the Pāndavas is the hero. He is a valorous epic character. Here in this drama also Bhīma Is narrated as a valorous hero. Vira is the dominent sentiment. *Adbhuta* and *sṛṅgāra* are the supporting sentiments.

2.V. Dūtavākya

Dūtavākya is a one act play narrating the story of Kṛṣṇa acting as an ambassador of Pāṇḍavās. *Vīra* is considered as the main sentiment of the play supported by *roudra* .

2. VI. Cārudatta

Cārudatta is an incomplete drama in four acts. The love of *Vasanta* a courtesan girl with *Cāru*datta, a rich Brahmin who has turned to poverty because of his generous activities is the theme fo the play. *Sringāra* is

the main sentiment. Humor and pathos are used as supporting sentiments.

0.2. VII. Karṇabhāra

Karṇabhāra is a one-act play based on the story of Karna in Mahābhārata. Karna is famous for his quality of generosity. Bhasa also narrates him as a generous character as in Mahābhārata. *Dānavīra* is interpreted as the main sentiment. There is an under current of pathos in this drama. Even if Karna is walking knowingly towards his doom, he was in a high spirit of a valorous warrior.

2.VIII. Ūrubhaṅga

Ūrubhaṅga is the only tragic play in Sanskrit literature. Bhasa had taken the theme from the great epic Mahābhārata. Duryōdhana, the villainous character in Mahābhārata is interpreted as a hero with all the heroic qualities. In the scene of his encounter with Bhīma, the sentiment of *vīra* is reflected. Here Duryōdhana is depicted as a good character entirely different form Mahābhārata. His death at the hands of Bhīma rouses the sentiment of *karuna*. As a hero he repents on his evil doings and at the same time he praises the good qualities of his opponents. Here the spectator will appreciate Duryōdhana as a hero who is seen presented as a villainous character in Mahābhārata. In this drama the sentiment of valour is supported by an under current of pathos.

2. IX. Sentiment in the 13 dramas of Bhāsa.

Drama	Main Sentiment	Subsidiary Sentiment
Dūtavākya	Vīra	Adbhuta
Karṇabhāra	Vīra	Karuṇa
Dūtaghtōtkaca	Vīra	Karuṇa
Ūrubhanga	Vīra	Karuṇa & roudra
Madhyamavyāyōga	Vīra	Karuṇa,adbhuta & raudra
Pañcarātra	Vīra	Hāsya
Abhiṣēka nāṭaka	Vīra	Karuṇa, adbhuta & bhayānaka
Bālacarita	Vīra	Adbhuta & Karuṇa
Pratimānātaka	Vīra	Karuṇa, śṛṅgāra & hāsya
Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa	Vīra	Adbhuta, hāsya & śṛṅgāra
Svapnavāsavadatta	śṛṅgāra	Karuṇa
Avimāraka	śṛṅgāra	Hasya, karuṇa, adbhuta & bhayānaka
Cārudatta	śṛṅgāra	Hāsya

3.0. Analysis

Bhāsa is a great dramatist in the history of Sanskrit literature with a collection of 13 different types of dramas. In each drama this master dramatist puts to test different sentiments. For the purpose he reinterprets the story, character and other elements of great Itihāsa and folk-tales. In the reinterpretation of sentiment the dramatist deviates very much from the original source so as to re-interpret in a specific way relishing to the audience. He is the only dramatist who has interpreted al most all sentiments in his dramas.

Bhāsa's usage of *sringāra* deserves special mention. Bhāsa narrated *śṛṅgāra* with out the touch of vulgarity. We can recollect the beauty of the heroines of Kālidāsa and other authors, due to their style of description. But Bhāsa didn't narrate his heroines in such a style. His narration differs from the other dramatists. Analysis of rasa in the dramas of Bhāsa reveals his psychological insight. In Svapnavāsavadatta and Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa he adds sentiment according to the context and mood of the character. Bhāsas usage of *rasa* strongly reveals the psychological feelings of Vāsavadatta. In Karṇabhāra also we can find how Bhāsa expresses the psychological feeling through *rasa.*

4.0. Conclusion

The sentiment in a poetic composition is not just for sentiments, but it is for conveying the mental stage of

each and every character to the receiver / audience. So a psychological insight is necessary for using the sentiment properly. Bhāsa possessed the psychological insight and so he became successful in the usage of *rasa* (sentiment). To asses the sentiment of a drama an academic study can't perform much. Theatre presentation of the drama in the traditional method can express the sentiment properly.

There is a dictum about Bhāsa - bhāsō hāsaḥ kavikulaguru kālidasō vilasah. Normally this dictum has interpreted Bhāsa as a humorous dramatist, but it is not true. Among the 13 plays of Bhāsa 10 have *vīra* and three have *sringāra* as main sentiment. So the first half of the dictum means that (Bhāso hāsah) he is a poet of delight. Bhāsa flourished before Bharata who is the propounder of *rasa* theory. But Bhāsa has skillfully employed the nine *rasas* in his dramas. It means Bhāsa analysed the emotions of human mind in each circumstance and used them in his plays to nourish the sentiment. If Bhāsa is considered prior to Bharata, an influence of Bhāsa may have happened on Bharata in developing the theory of *rasa*. This aspect deserves special attention.

THE TRAGIC CHARACTERS OF BHĀSA

Sandhya B. Nair

काव्येषु नाटकं रम्यं -is a famous saying in Sanskrit. Among the different varieties of poetical compositions the most entertaining and serious one is the drama. There are a number of dramas in Sanskrit literature that had drawn their plot from the epics and other tales. These plays were composed taking into account the depth of thought contained in the epics and their impact on the imagination of the dramatist. 'The tragic characters of Bhāsa', the present study is mainly based on Bhāsa's three well known dramas. *Ūrubhaṅga*, Svapnavāsavadatta and *Karṇabhāra*, The tragic characters of these plays viz. Duryodhana, Vasavadatta and Karṇa are highlighted here. According to Aristotle a tragedy possesses the entire essence of an epic. In a tragedy, imitation possesses a short life span to reach its end it gives up the timelag by telling the story timely by avoiding the unwanted explanations. The level of acceptance of the viewers is quite different when they see Sophocie's Oedipus and its elaborated vision in the format of Iliad.

Concept of tragedy in General

Tragedy is a fascinating problem for literary and aesthetic study. In the context of literaryart, a mere

spectacle of sorrow that has power to bring us to the brink of tears becomes tragic; and this term is very common in the context of drama. The first tragedies known to literary history are the religious tragedies, the passion play of Egypt and Syria. The religious plays, based on mythological characters, have a theme closely related to nature and ritual.

In the oriental literatures there is no evidence of tragedy. The medieval plays of Japan contain some tragic concepts, but they are mostly ghost plays. One of the characteristic themes of tragic representation in the ancient days is the conflict between the hero drawn from mythology, Prehistory or legends and his antagonist. This conflict resulting in the hero's death and resurrection a symbolises the death and rejuvenation of the nature.

The word tragedy itself comes from the Greek term 'trag Oidia' which means a goat song.[1] Dante writes, tragedy in the beginning is good to look upon and quiet, in its end or exit is *fated* and horrible, for this reason it gets its name from 'tragos' - which is goat, and oda (meaning, song) as though to say goatish song, that is fetid on the manner of a goat, this is made plain by the example of Seneca in his tragedies.

---

[1] G.K. Bhat, Tragedy and Sanskrit Drama, Popular Prakashan, Bombay, 1974, p.2.

To understand the requirements of tragedy, we must begin with Aristotle's definition. To him, tragedy is a representation of an action, which is serious, complete in itself, and of a certain length, it is expressed in speech made beautiful in different ways in different parts of the play, it is acted, not narrated and by exciting pity and fear it gives a healthy relief to such emotions.[2]

His definition is restricted by two considerations. He framed his definition on the basis of Greek plays of his days and is attempted to expound by elaboration and refute by critical comment, the view which Plato expressed about poetry. But the main direction for the variation still flows from Aristotle's definition.

The tragic concept in Sanskrit Drama

The characteristic features of the Indian drama, which strike the western student are the entire absence of tragedy, the interchange of lyrical stanzas, with prose dialogue, use of Sanskrit for some characters and Prakṛt for others.[3]

Sanskrit drama is a mixed composition, in which, the joy is mingled with sorrow, in which the jester usually plays a prominent part, while the hero and

---

[2] Ibid, p.7.

[3] A.A. Macdonell, History of Sanskrit Literature, Motilal Banarsidas Publisher P Ltd, Delhi - 1900, p . 293.

heroine are often in the depth of despair. All great dramas tend to concentrate upon characters. The death of the hero must never be exhibited. The emotion of terror, grief or pity with which the audience are inspired, are therefore always tranquillised by termination of the story. Nor may any deeply tragic incident take place in the course of the play, for death is never allowed to be represented on the stage.

For example, Abhijñāśakuntala, the world renowned play of Kalidasa, is now a comedy, eventhough the real story is a tragic one. The conversion of tragedy into comedy is a peculiar nature of Sanskrit literature and most of the poets adopted this method also.

Duryodhana in Ūrubhanga

Bhasa's Ūrubhanga is the only tragedy in Sanskrit dramatic literature. The core element of this one - act play is taken from the great epic Mahābhārata. It deals with the fall of Duryodhana with his thighs broken by the mace of Bhima, the last few hours of his life and the Ultimate death. Bhāsa reconstructed the epic incident and presented it in a novel manner, which is unknown to the epic author. The incident and major characters belong to the original story. The crushing of the thighs of Duryodhana is the central theme.

As the scene opens, Duryodhana is crawling on the stage; with his thighs broken and in a bloody mess. Ūrubhaṅga - breaking of the thighs, is supposed to be an end of the incident, which is already over, before the play opens. The rules of Dramaturgy never forbid the showing of actual fight on the stage. Bhāsa had cleverly placed of fight scene 'behind the curtain' and paved the way to an inevitable method of narration.

Aesthetic satisfaction through structural unity is, one of the aims that Bhāsa has possessed in his mind. His actual purpose is to achieve a complete change in characterisation. In Ūrubhaṅga, he places Duryodhana at the centre of the dramatic action. The thigh breaking incident is no longer a simple event, in the prolonged war, which means the end of the wicked character.

The epic paints Duryodhana as an anti - hero and his end, therefore must be the victory of the devine justice. Although the victorious Pāndavas used foul means to accomplish it, the epic poet's sympathy remains still with them, because their stand was correct and the kauravas were denied their cousin's rightful share of the ancestral property. Bhāsa stands for Duryodhana rather than Pāndava and wipes out the bad impression of the wicked as created by the epic poet.

Bhāsa's Ūrubhaṅga is a subjective interpretation and the personal story of Duryodhana. A tragic play cannot be constructed with a Villain or wicked character as the focus of entire dramatic attention, while using a legendary theme. But Bhāsa through Ūrubhanga creates a heroic image to Duryodhana by giving him in the full emotional support. In other words, Duryodhana is the tragic hero in this play, because, besides other things the play ends with his death. Bhāsa portrays Duryodhana by giving him the heroic nobility and reconstructing the incident.

Bhāsa's special treatment of the character makes Duryodhana a blend of good and bad. The epic introduces him as a human being having some wicked traits as found in most men and also having some grand traits too. Bhāsa uses his entire ability to make a human hero out of Duryodhana.

To Aristotle, the tragic hero incurs misfortune not as a result of voice or depravity, but by some error of judgement while enjoying reputation and prosperity. Duryodhana falls within this concept.

Vāsavadatta in Svapnavāsavadatta

The play Svapnavāsavadatta portrays two rival queens Vāsavadatta and Padmāvati. By virtue of their situation they are rivals, but by the virtue of their

goodness of heart they are true friends. In this triangle love story, the king Udayana, the embodiment of ironic pathos, is at the apex. While honouring Padmāvati, the newly married, Udayana is very much haunted by the memories of Vāsavadatta whom he believed to be dead. Here the hero stands in utter confusion as to past or present, illusion or reality.[4]

The plot is embeded with political intrigue and has some plausibility in the world of politics, but high effectiveness is given to the symbolical stage. In order to keep in sovereign's throne, a wise minister had made the arrangements of a new marriage in an adverse situation, and polygamy or plurality of wives is admitted to an Indian monarch at that time. For this politically needed marriage, the devious minister burns a village and propagates a rumour that both he and the royal Vasavadatta have been consumed in that flames as previously planned by the minister. Vāsavadatta becomes an assistant to the princess of Magadha named Padmāvati, whom the minister had selected in his own mind as a bride for Udayana. Udayana is finally induced to visit Magadha and is seen by Vāsavadatta though she remains for most of the time, out of his vision. He has viewed her in flesh, but he thinks that he holds her in a

[4] Henry. W. Wells, Six Sanskrit Plays, Asia Publishing House, 1964, p - 15.

vision. By overhearing the conversations Padmāvati learns that Udayana is still in love with the wife whom he supposes dead. Meanwhile the unfortunated Vāsavadatta is asked to weave Padmāvati's wedding garlands and live with her as a servant.[5]

The third chapter of this play reveals the mental conflict of Vasavadatta thus- विवाहामोदसङ्कुले अन्तःपुरचतुःशाले परित्यज्य पत्मावतीमिहागतस्मि प्रमदवनं यावदिदानीं भागधेयनिर्वत्तं दुःखं विनोदयामि। अहो अत्याहितम्। आर्यपुत्रोऽपि नाम परकीयः संवृत्तः। यावद् उपविशामि । धन्या खलु चक्रवाकवधूः याऽन्योन्य विरहिता न जीवति। न खल्वाहं प्राणान् परित्यजामि। आर्यपुत्रं पश्यामित्येतेन मनोरथेन जीवामि मन्तभागा।[6]

Vāsavadatta is subjected to bitter emotional trials throughout the play. Firstly departed from her beloved husband she being a poor viction of internal politics, had to live as an assistant to his own second wife. The minister regarded her as a key to protect the kingdom at the risk of her very life. She renounced her husband, her youth, her royally and her soul for other's sake.

Bhāsa depicts touchingly the strain and stress suffered by Vāsavadatta as a servant. Udayana's arrival to Magadha, his first encounter with Padmāvati and

---

[5] Henry . W. Wells, Six Sanskrit plays, Asia Publishing House, 1964, p - 5.

especially the sentiments of Vāsavadatta on her parting, are sketched powerfully and brilliantly. Vasavadatta suffers a lot on behalf of her husband. She is forced to share her husband with another lady. No lady will be so broad minded to act like vasavadatta. However vasavadatta is presented as a tragic character in the play swapnavasavadatta.

Karṇa in Karṇabhāra

Karṇabhara, though the shortest among the one - act plays of Bhāsa, is artistically perhaps the most important one. The story of Karṇa is related in various parvans of the Mahābhārata.

In the Mahābharata, karṇa lacks favourable light and there is very little in him to call our sympathy and admiration. He is the headstrong of kauravas, pales into dim before the glamour of the Pandava hero Arjuna and the brilliant Krishna. Bhāsa himself provides a glimpse of Karna's epic character through the Dhritarashtra's words describing as blundering, ridiculous, pitiable and foolish fellow who obtained the lore missiles by fraud and found that they were useless at the moment of crisis. In Dhitarashtra's opinion Karṇa could hardly be a match of

---

[6] M.R. Kale, Svapnavasavadatta of Bhasa, Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan, Jawaharnagar, Bunglow Road, Delhi - 110 007, 1988, p - 68.

Arjuna even if fire, Indra, Rudra are combained to train him in the art of warfare.

The art of literature has turned Karṇa into a tragic hero demanding our sympathy, admiration and awe in virtue of the height of selfless nobility he reaches and the great Bhāsa has started this trend, and other Sanskrit dramatists like Bhatta Nārayaṇa have picked up the cue from him. The image of Karṇa as a tragic hero thus stands deep-rooted in the Indian mind. Karṇabhara presents a picture of the last or the penultimate moments in Karṇa's life as Karṇa marched towards the battlefield with a heavy burden on his mind. The meeting between Indra and karṇa, in which Karṇa parts with his ear-ring which he received at his birth from his father, the son-god, is the centre of this drama. It reveals the heart of Karna's personality. Karṇa has a flair for generosity and it has no limit. He must offer himself as a gift to satisfy a supplicant. It is a great virtue which men rarely possess and even all gods may not have. But carried to the level of self sacrifice it is a fatal vice.

Karṇa's personal tragedy stems from this fatal flaw. In parting with his Kavacakundala, Karṇa was signing his own death warrant. From this dear out heroic grindecy and incomparable nobility Karṇa's limitless generosity could easily be described. Even in Aristotelian sense,

Karṇa is comparable to the Shakspearian tragic heroes like Macbeth or Lear.[7]

To gain artistic unity Bhāsa altered the sequence of epic events, changed characterisation, omitted unwanted details and added new touches of the story of Mahābhārata. In Karṇabhāra, meeting with Karṇa and Indra, his confrontation with Parasurama, his command to kuru forces and his death are fused in new sequence. The main episode in it is intended to spell Karṇa's nobility and also his inevitable doom, the other incidents are designed to create a sense of tragic groom and tragic hero.

Conclusion

Drama the essential element of Sanskrit literature falls in the category of मिश्रकाव्य. Poetry, by its inherent nature, is divided into two दृश्य and श्रव्य (seen or head) Drama falls under the first division ie दृश्य. Rupaka is the general term in Sanskrit for all dramatic compositions.

Some Western Critics made an attempt to show that Sanskrit Drama had its origin from the Greek Drama. They held that Greek drama came to India after Alexander's invasion and that gave rise to the Indian

---

[7] G.K. Bhat, Tragedy and Sanskrit Drama, Popular Prakashan, Bombay 1974, p - 81

dramas. The Greek drama differs from Indian drama, but there exit some similarities also. The striking differences between them are the absence of tragedy and non-observance of unity of **time and place.**

I here highlight the tragic characters of Bhāsa, by giving special reference to Duryodhana of Ūrubhanga, Vasavadatta of Svapnavasavadatta and Karṇa of Karṇabhāra. The plot of the above had been taken from the great epic and tales. The Ūrubhanga is a one act play which dramatizes a well - known incident in the epic war described in the Mahābhārata and it is regarded as the best tragedy in Sanskrit literature ever known. Bhāsa showers heroic nobility and virtue on Duryodhana and makes him a tragic hero.

In Svapnavasavadatta the poet's gifted imagination plays well and it gives emphasis to the mental agonies of Vasavadatta. Karṇabhāra envisages the generosity of the great Karṇa. It describes the Indra's capturing of Karṇa's armour and ear rings that paves the way for fall of the hero. The whole play is charged with the atmosphere of pathos.

इतिहासकथापात्राणि भासनाटकेषु

राजेन्द्रन् नायर् पी. के.

विश्वविश्रुतसंस्कृतवाङ्मये यावन्तो नाटककाराः प्रथन्ते तेषु महाकवेर्भासस्य स्थानं प्रथमगणनीयं वर्तते। कविकुलगुरुणा कालिदासेन आदरातिशयेन संस्मृतो भासः अवन्तिसुन्दरीकथायां दण्डिनापि स्मृतः[1]। कवेरस्य भासस्य देशकालादिविषयेवर्तमानो विवादः अद्यावधि नैव परिसमाप्तिमेति। केचन पण्डिताः भासद्वयं मन्यन्ते। ते एवमामनन्ति कालिदासादिकविभिरुल्लिखितो भासः प्रथमो भवति, सम्प्रति अस्य नाटकानि नोपलभ्यन्ते, परं गणपतिशास्त्रिणा प्रकाशितानि रूपकाणि नवस्य भासस्यैव भवितुमर्हन्ति। अपि तु निर्मत्सरबुद्धयो विद्वांसः यानि स्वप्नवासवदत्तप्रभृतीनि रूपकाणि गणपतिशास्त्रिणा प्रकाशितानि तेषां अन्तरङ्गपरीक्षया तानि सर्वाण्यपि प्राचीनभासकृतानि इति सिद्धान्तयन्ति।

भासस्य त्रयोदशरूपकाणि प्रसिद्धानि सन्ति। तानि महाभारताश्रितं रामायणाश्रितं तत्कालप्रचलितकथाश्रितं चेति त्रिधा विभक्तानि। तत्र च पञ्चरात्रं, दूतवाक्यं, दूतघटोत्कचम्, कर्णभारः ऊरुभङ्गम्, बालचरितम्, मध्यमव्यायोगः इत्येतानि रूपकाणि महाभारतीयकथामाश्रित्य कृतानि । अपि तु सर्वत्र अनुकूलपरिवर्तनं तेन विहितम्। प्रतिमानाटकस्य एवं अभिषेकनाटकस्य च कथावस्तु रामायणात् स्वीकृतं वर्तते। स्वजीवनकाले प्रचलितकथाभ्यः बीजमादाय उपनिबद्धानि रूपकाणि विद्यन्ते प्रतिज्ञायौगन्धरायणम्, अविमारकं, स्वप्नवासवदत्तं, दरिद्रचारुदत्तम् च।

पूर्वोक्तदिशा यद्यपि भासेन महाभारतात् कथावस्तु स्वीकृतं तथापि तदीयकथापात्राणि महाभारतवद् नैवावतरन्ति अस्य रूपकेषु। अनेन प्रतिभाधनेन विहितः कथापात्रव्यत्ययो भवति अत्र विचारविषयः।

भासप्रणीतमध्यमव्यायोगे घटोत्कचो भवति मुख्यकथापात्रम्। महाभारतात् केवलं घटोत्कचं नाम कथापात्रमादाय स्वीयरूपके तस्मै नूतनजनिं प्रददाति। वयं न पश्यामो महाभारते कुत्रापि घटोत्कचकृतब्राह्मणानामुपरोधः भीमेन विहितो तेषां मुक्तिश्च। अत्र च भासनाटकविचक्षणः कावालं नारायणप्पणिक्कर् महाभाग एवमभिप्रैति ''ऐतरेयब्राह्मणस्तशुनश्शेभाख्यानेन सह पाण्डववनवासकथां संयुज्य भासेन नूतन कथावस्तु कृतम्।''

महाभारते यश्च घटोत्कचः उपनिबद्धः सो ब्राह्मणद्वेषी अधर्मिष्ठश्च भवति। द्रोणपर्वे सत्यमिदं स्पष्टतां याति।'' घटोत्कचवधे कृते सति श्रीकृष्णोऽत्यन्तसन्तुष्टो बभूव। एतस्य हेतुर्जिज्ञासायां तेनोक्तं यत् घटोत्कचः न केवलं ब्राह्मणद्वेषी अपि तु क्रूरकर्मा चासीत्। धर्मसंरथापनायैव सूर्यपुत्रेण कर्णेन अयं निहितः। (2)

यदा तु सः घटोत्वचः भासस्य तूलिकायां समायातः तदा अस्य नूतनछाया संलब्धा। मातृनियोगाद् यद्यपि ब्राह्मणापहरणे संप्रवृत्तः तथापि तस्य चेतसि मानवसहानुभूतिरुत्पद्यते। ज्येष्ठमिष्टतमं न शक्तोमि परित्यक्तुमिति पितरि उक्ते सति यथार्यो ज्येष्ठमिच्छति तथा अहमपि कनिष्ठमिच्छामि इति मात्रा उक्तम्। तदा तु पित्रोरनिष्टः कस्येदानीं प्रियः इति मध्यमस्य प्रश्ने जाते सानूभूत्या इदमब्रवीत् घटोत्कचः'' प्रीतोस्म्यहमिति''(3)

''जानामि सर्वत्र सदा च नाम द्विजोत्तमाः पूज्यतमाः पृथिव्याम्

अकार्यमेतश्च मयाद्य कार्यं मातुर्नियोगादपनीय शङ्काम्''

इति घटोत्कचवचसा अस्य ब्राह्मणाद्वेषः अधर्मिष्ठता च तस्माद् दूरं याति। क्रूरकर्मप्रवृत्तेऽपि अस्य चेतसि संजातो विषादभावः अत्र ध्वन्यते। हिडिम्बा अपि अत्र अस्याः राक्षसीभावमतिक्रम्य तिष्ठति। भीममुद्दिश्य निजपुत्रं घटोत्कचं प्रति उक्तवती यत् '' अस्माकं दैवतं भवत्यसौ, अभिवादयस्व पितरमिति। अस्मादिदमवगन्तुं शक्यते यत् मध्यमव्यायोगनामकरूपकद्वाराकद्वारा अधमपात्राण्यपि उन्नेतुं यावान् यत्नः कृतवानसौ भासः। पी. नीरायणक्कुरुप् महाभागस्य निगमनमपि उक्तमिदमनुसरति यत् ज्ञात्वा अज्ञात्वा वा बहुत्र तमोगुणशालिनः इति प्रसिद्धानां जीवने रजतरेखाः परिपश्यति कविरेषः।(4)

घटोत्कचं नायकं कृत्वा विरचितं अपरं रूपकं भवति दूतघटोत्कचम्।घटोत्कचस्य दूतनियोगविषये केचन अनौचित्यदोषं समुद्भावयन्ति। तेषामभिप्राये युद्धे संप्रवृत्ते एवं च कृष्णस्य दूतश्रमे पराजिते राक्षसकुलप्रसूतस्य धटोत्कचस्य दौत्यश्रमः परिहासाय कल्पते। विषयेऽस्मिन् पूर्वोक्त विचक्षणस्य कुरुप्महाभागस्य चिन्ता श्रद्धेया वर्तते, सा तु मध्यमव्यायोगनामकरूपकद्वारा भासचेतसि प्राप्तस्थानं घटोत्कचनामकंपात्रं मुख्यधारायाम् आनीय संस्थापयितुं संजातकुतूहलोऽभूद् एष महाकविः।

अस्मिन् रूपके उन्नतकथापात्रत्वेन घटोत्कचोऽस्माकं दृष्टिगोचरतां प्राप्नोति। अरण्यौका अपि घटोत्कचः कौरवसभायां समागम्य लोकव्यवहारज्ञः एवं विनम्रतायुक्तश्च सन् व्यवहरति।

धृतराष्ट्रस्य सन्निधौ पितामह अभिवादये घटोत्कचः इत्युक्त्वा, इत्थं स्ववचनस्य व्यत्ययं विहितवान्, न न अयमक्रमः युधिष्ठिरादयश्च मे गुरवो भवन्तमाभिवादयन्ति, पश्चात् घटोत्कचोऽहमाभिवादये इति। परिहासयुक्तवचनप्रदातारं शकुनिं प्रति एवमेव भीषणवचनप्रयुक्तवन्तं दुर्योधनं प्रत्यपि घटोत्कचेन यद्प्रत्युत्तरं दत्तं तत् तस्य वाक्पटुत्वस्य धीरतायाः संस्कारचित्तस्य च निदर्शनत्वेन विलसति।

रूपकेस्मिन् दूतघटोत्कचे धृतराष्ट्रः गान्धारी दुश्शला च महाभारतीयस्वीयभावान् अपेक्ष्य औन्नत्यं पाण्डवबन्धुतां प्रदर्शयन्ति। अभिमन्युवधवृत्तान्तं निशंम्य राज्ञा धृतराष्ट्रेण यत् कथितं तत् पूर्वोक्तं स्पष्टीकरोति।

केनैतच्छ्रुतिपथद्षणंकृतं मे
कोऽयं मे प्रियमिति विप्रियं ब्रवीति।
कोऽस्माकं शिशुवधपातकाङ्क्षितानाम्
वंशस्य क्षयमद्योषयत्यभीतः।।

हा वत्स अभिमन्यो ईदृशोपि पुरुषंक्षयकरे कुलविग्रहे वर्तमाने बालभावनिमज्जनमस्माकं भाग्यक्रमेण कुर्वन् कुत्रेदानीं पौत्रक गतोऽसि इति वचनधारिण्यां गान्धार्यां मातरि पौत्रस्नेहः पूर्णतां याति। दुश्शला स्वभर्त्रा जयद्रथेनैव अभिमन्युः निक्ति इति ज्ञात्वा इत्थं ब्रवीति 'उत्तरासमीपं यास्यामि इति।'' अस्याः ईदृशवचनाद् अवगन्तुं शक्यते यत् स्वपित्रोः पाण्डवान् प्रति यो भावः आसीत् सा एव भाव तस्याः दुश्शलायाः अप्यवर्तत इति।

यद्यपि दूतघटोत्कचे पूर्वोक्तपात्राणि औन्नत्यं भजन्ते तथापि दुर्योधनः दुश्शासनः शकुनिश्च तथा नैव कुरुते। तेषां तत्र वर्णनं पाण्डवविरोधित्वरूपेण अधार्मिकत्वेन च । अस्य हेतुत्वेन इदमेव परिकल्पितुं शक्यते यत् अत्र नाटककर्तुः लक्ष्यस्तु घटोत्कचस्य उदात्तीकरणमेव।

रूपकं चैतदाद्दिकृत्य गणपतिशास्त्रिमहाभागः यदभिवदति तत् नितरां सत्यत्वमेति। तेन उक्तं यत् ''दूतघटोत्कचं नाम भासरूपकमपि न सुखान्तम् अपि तु दुःखान्तमेवेति''। वस्तुतः दुतघटोत्कचे जयद्रथवधः प्रत्यक्षविषयो नैव भवति चेदपि अर्जुनस्य प्रतिज्ञया अस्य हननस्य आनन्तर्यमत्र ध्वन्यते। एवमेव दुर्योधनादिकुरुजनानाम्।

दूतवाक्ये नायकस्थानमलङ्करोति भगवान् वासुदेवः। पञ्चरात्रादिगतदुर्योधनाद्भिन्नत्वेनैव दुर्योधनोऽत्र चित्रीकृतः। महाभारतीयदुर्योधनादुपरि दुरात्मतां दूतवाक्यस्थदुर्योधनो आवहति। दूतरूपेणसमागतं भगवन्तं परिहसितुम् अनेन दुर्योधनेन द्रौपदीकेशकर्षणचित्रपटं सभायां प्रदर्शितम्। वृत्तं चैतद् दुर्योधनस्य अधर्मिष्ठतां सुतरां प्रस्पष्टीकरोति। वासुदेवस्य महत्वोपवर्णने मतिं दत्तवान् भासः इत्थं कृतवानित्यनुमातुं शक्यते। यदा अस्य भगवतो दौत्यं निष्फलं जातं तदा सुदर्शनादि दिव्यायुधानां सहसा प्रत्यक्षीकरणेन अद्भुतरसमपि समायोजयति नाटककारः।

विराटपर्वतः कथाबीजमादाय निजप्रयुक्तभेदेन विरचितं रूपकं भवति पञ्चरात्रं नाम। अत्रत्यः प्रधानपात्रो भवितुमर्हति राजा दुर्योधनः। अत्र दुर्योधनस्य धार्मिकभावप्रदर्शने उद्युक्तो भवति

नाटककारः। अकार्षित् दुर्योधनः सर्वविशिष्टं यागम्। अवभृतस्नानवेलायां नितरां गुरुभक्तिरनेन प्रदर्शिता। तत्र तु यज्ञाचार्यस्थानमलंकृतवान् द्रोणः स्वस्य दक्षिणारूपेण पाण्डवेभ्य राज्यं प्रदादव्यमिति विनिर्दिष्टवान्। तथाकर्तुम् उद्युक्तो भवति दुर्योधनः। यद्यपि अस्मिन् दुर्योधनस्य अस्ति पाण्डवविरोधता तथापि अभिमन्युं प्रति तस्यास्ति वात्सल्यभावः। कर्णस्यापि अत्रत्यचित्रीकरणं सुशैल्या वर्तते।

भासनाटकेषु अतिप्रसिद्धिमावहति कर्णभारं नाम नाटकं यत्र कर्णः मुख्यकथापात्रत्वेन उपवर्णितः। महाभारतस्य विभिन्नभागेभ्यः कथावस्तुं आदाय परस्परं संयोज्य नूतनं रूपकं प्रणिनाय कविरसौ भासः। महाभारतीयाद् उद्धतकर्णाद् नितारां भिन्नत्वेनैव कर्णभारे अमुम् प्रथमकैन्तेयं वयं पश्यामः। यः महाभारते दुर्योधनस्य अधमकर्मणां बलं प्रयच्छन् एवं यश्च भीष्मद्रोणादिभ्यः कुप्यति सो असौ राधेयः कर्णभारे आदितप्रभृति अनुकम्पार्हो दृश्यते। रणाङ्कणे समायाते सति मातृवाक्यं गुरुशापं च अभिस्मरत्येषकर्णः। स्वस्य दिव्यास्त्राणां परीक्षणवेलायां तानि निष्फुलानि इति प्रतिबुद्धो भवत्यससौ। अस्मिन्नेव काले तस्य एकाश्रयं कुण्डलं च छलवेषधारिण्या इन्द्रेण अपहृतम्। अत्र निजहननं ज्ञात्वापि स्वस्य एकरक्षामार्गस्यापि प्रदाने प्रवृत्तस्य नायकस्य अस्य कर्णस्य उत्कृष्टभाव उच्चतां प्राप्यते।

मूलकथायां रणाङ्कणं नैव दानस्य भूमिः। एवं च तत्र प्रतिफलेच्छापि तस्यासीत् कुण्डलप्रदानवेलायाम्। अपि तु कर्णभारे युद्धसज्जो भूत्वा यदा रणाङ्कणं प्रति कर्णः प्रस्थितः तदा भवति कुण्डलप्रदानम्। एवञ्च कर्णभारे प्रतिफलेच्छाप्रेरितो नैव भवत्यसौ

कर्णः। किंच प्रथमं तावद् इन्द्रदूतेन वाग्दत्तशक्तिरपि स्वीकर्तुं न प्रयतते, ब्राह्मणवाग् इति हेतुत्वात् स्वीकर्तव्यमिति पुनः प्रबोधनेनैव तां शक्तिं एष स्वीकरोति।

भासस्य कर्णः न केवलं दानशीलः अपि तु विनम्रश्च भवति। इतिहासे युद्धवेलायां निजपराक्रमाणि साभिमानं अभिवदन्नेव रणाङ्कणं प्रति व्रजति कर्णः। राधेयस्य ईदृशात्मप्रशंसांसोढुमसहमानः शल्यर्महाभागः काकहंसयोः कथां भणित्वा युयुत्सुं तं परिहसति(6) कर्णभारे तु 'महत्तरां भिक्षां याचे' इति विप्रशब्दमाकर्ण्य सविनयं कर्णस्स्वयमेव आह्वयति तं विप्ररूपिणमिन्द्रम्।

शल्योनामकथापात्रमपि मूलस्रोतसः व्यत्ययेनैवाविष्कृतो भासेन कर्णभारे। महाभारते यं शल्यं वयं पश्यामः स सधैर्यं रणाङ्कणं गच्छन्तं कर्णं परिहासवचसा दुर्बलीकरोति। पुरा युधिष्ठिराय प्रदत्तं शल्यवाग्दानमनुसृत्य इत्थं कृतमिति महाभारतकर्तुः । वचनाद् अवगम्यते। अपि च भासप्रणीतशल्यः कर्णस्य हितानुसारी एवं उत्तम सारथिश्च भवति। समराङ्कणे तिष्ठतिः कर्णस्य मनसि संजातव्यथां सारथिरेष सश्रद्धं सक्षमया श्रृणोति। अन्ततोगत्वा इन्द्रस्य कुण्डलप्रदानवेलायां तस्मात् दानकर्मणः उपरुध्यते चानेन।

पूर्वं प्रतिनायकस्थाने तिष्ठन्तं कर्णसदृशं कथापात्रं उन्नतश्रेण्यां संस्थाप्य विलिखिता प्रथमसाहित्यसृष्टिरपि कदाचित् भासस्य वा भवेत्। दुष्टपात्राणि इति लोके प्रसिद्धिमावहितानां कथापात्राणं अन्तः अपि गुणान्वितानि मनांसि सन्तीति क्रान्तदर्शी भासकविः साक्षात्करोति। विषयेस्मिन् डा. के. जि. पौलोस्महाभागेन यद् निगदितं तत् श्रद्धेयं वर्तते "ये गुणान्वितैः नायकश्रेष्ठैः पराजिताः ते

केवलं दुष्टमूर्तयो नहि भवितुमर्हन्ति, अपि तु तेषामप्यस्ति सुहृदयवमिति वेत्ति काविर्भासः। तस्मात् प्रतिनायकानां प्रति महात्मनोऽस्य पक्षपातता।''(7)

यथा महाभारतीयकर्णः भासेन नायकत्वेन संभावितः तथा महाभारतस्थनीचतमकथापात्रमिति प्रसिद्धं दुर्योधनं नायकत्वेन परिकल्प्य कृतं भासनाटकं भवति ऊरूभङ्गम्। संस्कृतसाहित्ये यानि नाटकानि सन्ति तेषां मध्ये एकंदुरन्तनाटकमिति प्रसिद्धिरप्यस्ति अस्य ऊरुभङ्गस्य। अत्र च नायके दुर्योधने क्रोधादिदुर्गुणानि नैवोपलभन्ते। उज्वलकथापात्रत्वेन एव ऊरुभङ्गे सः समायाति। महाभारत युद्धावसाने दुर्योधनेन द्वन्द्वयुध्दार्थं भीमो आहूतः। युध्दारम्भे दुर्योधनस्य गदाप्रहरणे महारथो भीमः भूमौ न्यपतत्। अथ भगवतो वासुदेवस्य अभिज्ञां ज्ञात्वा वायुपुत्रोऽसौ भीमः दुर्योधनस्य ऊरुविदारणं चकार। रुधिरप्रवाहेण रङ्गमञ्जे शेतेऽसौ सुयोधनः। युद्धनीतिमनतिक्रम्य कृतमिदं दुर्योधननिपातनम्। तद्दृष्टवा भीमाय कुप्याति बलरामः। रणङ्कणे मृतप्रायः सन् शयानः सुयोधनः क्रोधमवलम्बन्तं बलरामं शान्तान्वितं करोति। वृत्तं चेदं दुर्योधनस्य प्रेक्षकानां मनसि तं प्रति सहानुभूतिं संजनयितुं प्रभवति।

तादृशदारुणावस्थायां अन्यस्मिन् अपि जन्मनि त्वं मम माता भव इति स्वमातरं गान्धारीं प्रति दुर्योधनोऽभिवदति। तदातु प्रत्युत्तरमेवं उक्तवती गान्धारी मम मनोरथः खलु त्वया भणितः। अस्माद् गान्धारीवचनाद् सुष्टुमवगम्यते यत् स्वमातुः असौ दुर्योधनः यावान् प्रियंकर इति। स्वतनयाय दुर्जयाय यो उपदेशः प्रदत्तः सोऽपि अस्य दुर्योधनस्य श्रेष्ठत्वमुच्यैस्तरं प्रख्यापयति। ''अहमिव पाण्डवाः

शिश्रूषयितव्याः, तत्र भवत्याश्चाम्बायाः कुन्त्या निर्देशे वर्तितव्यः। अभिमन्योर्जननीद्रौपदी चोभये मातृवत्पूजयितव्ये।'' (8)

भासकृतो एष आविष्कारव्यत्ययः साहित्यलोके पुनर्विचिन्तनस्य हेतुत्वेन संवृत्तः। अस्मिन् विषये नाट्यशास्त्रविचक्षणेन कावालंमहाभागेन एवमभिप्रैति भासकृतं प्रतिनायकस्य नायकीकरणं विप्लवात्मकसमारम्भो भवितुमर्हति। (9) डा. पौलोस्सहाभाहस्य निगमनमपि पूर्वोक्तकावालपक्षं अनुसरति। तेनोक्तं यत् ''नायकपक्षपातेन भ्रष्टबुद्धीन् प्रेक्षकान् मार्गान्तरं नयत्यसौ भासः। चिरकालाङ्गीकृतनायकसङ्कल्पस्य निषेधो भवति भासस्य रचना।(10)

वस्तुतः भासविहितकथापात्रपरिवर्तनस्य प्रभावः कविकुलगुरुकालिदासेऽपि द्रष्टुं शक्यते इति वक्तुकामोऽस्मि। महाभारते दुष्यन्तः शकुन्तलायै प्रदत्तं निजवाग्दानं नहि परिपालयति अपि तु अभिज्ञानशाकुन्तले दुर्वासशापरुपं कञ्चिदुपायं स्वीकृत्य दुष्यन्तं तं निरपराधं करोति। अभिज्ञानस्य उपादानेन दुष्यन्तं संरक्षितुं या प्रेरणा कालिदासस्य सा कदाचित् तेन आदरातिशयेन संस्मृतात् भासादेव संलब्धास्यात्। पक्षमिमं स्वीकरोति तर्हि संस्कृतसाहित्ये यत् विश्रुतं नाटकं संजातम् तस्योत्पत्तेः प्रभवकेन्द्रत्वेन भासं संस्मर्तुं शक्यते।

अंङ्गीकृतनायकपक्षपातता विहाय भासस्य चिन्ता अन्यभाषासाहित्यकर्तृणामपि प्रेरणदायिका संजाता। अस्य अवान्तरफलत्वेन उज्वलाःकलासृष्टयः अत्र समाविर्भूताः। कैरळीभाषायां एम्.टी.महाभागस्य 'रण्डामूषम्', पी के बालकृष्णन्

महाभागस्य 'इनित्रानुरङ्गट्टे इत्यादि ग्रन्थान् अस्यनिदर्शनत्वेन स्वीकर्तुं शक्यते। भासः यद्यपि प्रतिनायकानामुदात्तीकरणं विदधाति तथापि धार्मिकमूल्यानां अप्राधान्यं नैव कुरुते। तद्वत् प्रसिद्धेतिहासधार्मिककथापात्राणां तेजोहानिरपि न क्रियते अनेन। मानवसमाजस्य विभिन्नमनोमण्डलेषुस्थितानां जनानां स्वांशीकरणम् भासस्य अस्य श्रेष्ठत्वम्।

''जानामिधर्मं न च मे प्रवृत्तिः
जानाम्यधर्मं न च मे निवृत्तिः
केनापि देवेन हृदिस्थितेन
यथा नियुक्तोऽस्मि तथा करोमि।''

इति व्यासवचनं कदाचित् दुर्योधनादि कथापात्राणं उदात्तीकरणे भासस्य प्रेरणास्त्रोतः। अस्माभिर्दृश्यते लोके यत् धर्मवेत्तारोऽपि जनाः अधर्माद् निवर्तुमशक्ताः। अन्तःकरणस्थितं संस्कारमनुसृत्यौव एकस्य प्रवृत्तिः निवृत्तिश्च।

'' सदृशं चेष्टते स्वस्याः प्रकृतेर्ज्ञानगनपि''

इति गीतावचनमपि उक्तस्य सत्यतां निगदति।

समाजस्य मुख्यधारायाः दूरं गत्वा अधर्मकर्मणि मतिं ददतो जनान् प्रायेण लोकोऽयं तिरस्करोति। इमा लोकरीतिं प्रतिबुद्ध्य पूर्वोक्तान् तिरस्कृतान् प्रति सहानुभूतिरेव लोकेन प्रदर्शयितव्या इति सन्देशं प्रदत्सुर्भवति भासः। एतदपि इतिहासिक प्रतिनायकानां भासनाटकेषु उदात्तीकरणस्य नायकीकरणस्य च हेतुर्भवितुमर्हति।

सूचिका

1. प्रथितयशसां भाससौमिल्लकविपुत्रादीनां प्रबन्धानतिक्रम्य कथं वर्तमानस्य कवेः कालिदासस्य कृतौ बहुमानः। मालविकाग्निमित्रम्, पु.2.
2. श्रीमहाभारतं, गद्यपरिभाषा, श्रीरामकृष्णमठम्, पुरनाट्टुकरा, तृश्शूर, पु. 112, 1999.
3. मध्यमव्यायोगः, प्रथमोङ्गः, पु.16.
4. पी. नारायणक्कुरुप्, प्राक्कथनम्, भासभारतम्, पु.17.
5. IDB, p.16.
6. श्रीमहाभारतं कर्णपर्वम्.
7. के. जि. पौलोस्, कूटियाट्टम्, पु.225.
8. ऊरुभङ्गम्
9. कावालं नारायणप्पणिक्कर, भासभारतम्
10. के. जी. पौलोस्, कूटियाट्टम्

CONTRIBUTORS

1. Dr.K.Kunjunni Raja, Former Hon. Director, Adayar Library and Research Centre, Adyar, Madras
2. Dr.N.P.Unni, Former Vice-Chancellor, Sree Sankaracharya University of Sanskrit, Kalady.
3. Dr.K.Vijayan, Professor and Director (Retd.), Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library University of Kerala, Kariavattom. P. O, Trivandrum - 81
4. Dr.T.Devarajan, Professor and Head, Department of Sanskrit, University of Kerala, Kariavattom.P.O, Trivandrum -81
5. Dr.M.Sivakumara Swamy, Professor and Head (Retd.), Dept.of Sanskrit, Bangalore University, Bangalore.
6. Dr.V.Sisupala Panicker, Reader, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Kerala, Kariavattom.P.O, Trivandrum -81
7. Dr.P.V.Ramankutty, Head of the Dept. of Sanskrit, Govt. Sanskrit College, Pattambi. P. O, Palghat (Dist)
8. Dr.N.Narayanan Namboothiri, Reader, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Calicut, Calicut.
9. Dr.P.Visalakshy. Reader and Head, Oriental Research Institute and Manuscripts Library, University of Kerala, Kariavattom. P. O, Trivandrum-81
10. Dr.G.Saradamma, Principal, Govt. Sanskrit College, Trivandrum -32
11. Dr.K.S.Lalithambal, Reader in Sanskrit, Maharaja's College, Ernakulam.
12. Prof.M.Muraleedharan Nair, Dept. of Sahitya,(Retd.), Govt. Sanskrit College, Trivandrum - 32.

13. Sri.G. Jaganath, Research Scholar, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Kerala, Kariavattom. P. O, Trivandrum - 81

14. Kum.Sandhya. B.Nair, Research Scholar, Dept. of Sanskrit, University of Kerala, Kariavattom. P. O, Trivandrum - 81

15. Sri.P.K.Rajendran, Research Scholar, Centre For Vedanta Studies, University of Kerala, Kariavattom. P. O, Trivandrum - 81.

Kerala University Sanskrit Series

Press (P) Ltd, Tvm-1